THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 3. JUNE, 1934. Vol. XXIV.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Dr. Angus on Trial.

Dr. Angus, Professor of New Testament and Historical Theology at St. Andrew's College, University of Sydney, who is being tried for heresy by the Presbyterian Church authorities in Australia, has just published his Defence in a notable volume entitled *Truth and Tradition.**

Dr. Angus shows as little tendency to evade the charges made by his opponents as he does to answer them superficially. His latest reply broadens and deepens the significance of his trial. He takes his stand both as the champion and exponent of the New Learning. His opponents, however sincere and zealous, represent for him a religious traditionalism which is nigh unto vanishing. With most modern theologians, Dr. Angus feels compelled to abandon the apocalyptic programme of Christianity with its eschatological imagery; the atonement viewed as a propitiatory and all-sufficient sacrifice; the Deity of Christ, but not His Divinity; Christ's physical resurrection; the post New Testament Trinitarian speculations; and, we need hardly add, the fundamentalist view of the Bible and the dogma of everlasting punishment.

Much of what Dr. Angus writes in his latest volume will be familiar enough to our readers, but the freshness, trenchancy

* Published by Angus and Robertson. (The Australian Book Company, 32 Great Russell Street, London, W.C.1. 3/6.)

and courage with which he presents his convictions should secure for this book a very wide circulation. This is the second volume which Dr. Angus has produced during his trial. The first one, *Jesus in the Lives of Men*,* although only published late in the autumn of 1933, has already passed into a second edition. We fear, however, that Dr. Angus is in a very precarious ecclesiastical position. It does not require very much knowledge to be a stout traditionalist. Neither does it require very much knowledge to be a robust secularist. It does, however, require a great deal of knowledge to be an effective modernist. Dr. Angus undoubtedly possesses this knowledge, but unfortunately his public, with very few exceptions, does not. Many of them will neither understand the distinctions which he makes nor the nature of the evidence upon which his conclusions are based. Whilst respecting him personally, they will feel that his ecclesiastical and theological position is impossible. This is the tragedy. It is only such Christian teaching as Dr. Angus can give which will make the Christian communion of which he is a distinguished leader, a growing moral and spiritual influence in Australia. But that communion, so we venture to think, possesses neither the knowledge, nor the courage, nor the insight to receive and propagate it.

Scottish Presbyterianism many years ago condemned for heresy the greatest scholar in her ministry, William Robertson Smith, later Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge. American Presbyterianism at a later date condemned for heresy the greatest scholar of her ministry, George Augustus Briggs, who became one of the editors of *The International Critical Commentary*. That Australian Presbyterianism in our own day should condemn the greatest scholar in her ministry is what the students of Church history may reasonably expect. It is the fate of the prophets to suffer such things because the religious communions which they address fail to recognize the Day of their Visitation.

Whither the Church?

Dr. Dearmer, in an article he contributes to the *Monthly Bulletin* of Exeter Cathedral of June, 1934, entitled 'Whither the Church?' emphasizes once again that it is only the Christian

* Published by Angus and Robertson, price 3/6.

religion, and not a ruthless and materialistic secularism, which can save the world. But if the Christian religion is to save the world, it can only do so through the operation of a Christian Church of which all portions are in fellowship. This united Church, Dr. Dearmer is assured, must take the form of a free federation of self-governing Churches:

> 'A new principle, distinct at once from separatism and from autocracy, has arrived. But the whole world cannot spring up to a great and new ideal in one generation.
>
> We have tested the principle of freedom and have found it good. We have now for a hundred years tested the principle of federation, which follows inevitably on the other; and we have found that it can bear the strain. There is no alternative before the peoples of the world.
>
> We shall carry out this principle wherever opportunity arises. We shall make friends; we shall link up with other communities whenever we can; we shall give help and get it; we shall weave new patterns of charity. And already in our own time there will come a great reward.'

Dr. Matthews in the May issue of the same magazine, in answer to the question 'What do you think about the future of religion?' replied:

> 'It is terribly difficult to say what will happen. I am sure we are at a turning point, a real crisis. Young people are extremely interested in religious problems, but I doubt whether many of them feel a conscious *need* for religion. The more idealistic type often find an outlet in social service, even in Communism. They ask about religion, "What real difference does it make?" and the business of the preacher must be to keep his religious message all the time related to the problems of their everyday lives. Young people, too, are much more intelligent than they were in my day, and I do not think that the old-fashioned appeal to the emotions, the so-called "Evangelical" appeal for conversion, carries much weight. The future of religion is safe if Christianity can be presented in a form which is in harmony with modern knowledge. That is the decisive factor.'

In answer to the question 'How do you think Reunion will come?' Dean Matthews replied:

> 'Some people look for a day when the Church will be presided over by a reformed Papacy, at Rome. I don't think anything of the kind is desirable. Reunion ought to come through federation, and I hope that the Episcopate will not evolve in the direction of the Patriarchate—large sees which may easily grow into rivalry under very powerful rulers—but in the direction of the primitive type of bishop, who simply presided over a College of Presbyters.

In reply to the question as to what is the function of a cathedral to-day, Dr. Matthews replied: 'A cathedral should be not merely a treasure-house but a lighthouse.' The Dean makes a

very significant remark about liturgical symbolism. 'Symbolism in worship can play a big part now that the old Puritan prejudice against it is dying out, but we need a religious symbolism which is not tied up with antiquated dogmas.'

The Failure of the Church Assembly.

There are many indications of a growing dissatisfaction with the Church Assembly as created by the Enabling Act of 1919. During the last fifteen years the Assembly has passed a number of useful legislative measures, which would never have received the sanction of Parliament but for the Church Assembly: yet many Churchmen are deeply disappointed with that body. It has not given 'Life and Liberty' to the Church. The Church to-day is weaker and smaller than it was then. The only section in the Church which has secured more liberty is the episcopate. Dr. H. R. L. Sheppard has utterly turned against the body he took such a prominent part in creating. In the editorial of *St. Martin's Review* for June, 1934, he laments that 'the chance was thrown away with both hands, and there seems no prospect that it will ever be recovered.' He recognizes the dire need for 'leadership' on the part of the Church, and complains that the Assembly fails to give it. He writes:

> 'It is easy enough to answer that it is not the function of the Church Assembly to assume any sort of moral or spiritual leadership: to point out that it is a body charged with concern for the work-a-day details of the Church's practical affairs. But it is not confined to such things. There is nothing whatever in its constitution to prevent its appealing boldly to the conscience of the nation.
>
> Why does it not do so? Because it has settled down with its subsidiary organizations into a sort of ecclesiastical civil service. At all costs it must be well-mannered and discreet. Its membership resembles nothing so much as the House of Commons before the passing of the Reform Bill. Look at the two elected houses. That of the clergy consists to a large extent of deans, archdeacons and canons with a sprinkling of suffragan bishops. With a very few exceptions the rest is made up of the comfortably preferred incumbents. The unbeneficed clergy are represented by two or three at most. It is a house of elderly clerics who have lost, if they ever possessed, the spirit of adventure, of willingness to be fools for Christ's sake. The House of Laity is made up of amiable and worthy men and women who have the leisure and money to spend three weeks, at the least, every year in London. Elections are seldom contested. The difficulty is to find people who are willing to be elected.

The Church Assembly is responsible for the central funds of the Church. Every year it budgets for about £145,000, which is raised through the parish quotas. The quotas are unpopular because there is a suspicion that the sums scraped together with such pain in poor parishes are used in part to pay large salaries to officials.

For instance, the Assembly has its missionary council, which is intended to stir up zeal for the missionary cause and to stimulate the flow of money for the Church's primary duty of preaching the gospel. But it takes a secretary at £800 a year and two assistant secretaries at £500 a year each, to say nothing of a staff of clerks and typists, to do the work. Asked to suggest economies, the secretary mentioned the possibility of reducing the wages of one of the typists!

All the officials at Headquarters are constantly engaged, directly or indirectly, in trying to impress on the miserably paid parochial clergy and their people the sacred duty of sacrifice. Is it surprising that their appeals are sometimes ignored?

The importance of these things lies in the fact that they reflect the mentality of the Church Assembly. It is dominated by the officially-minded members. In the short space of fourteen years it has acquired most of the evil traits of a well-entrenched bureaucracy. The rank and file, even if they wished to do so, are virtually powerless to break through the system. Only the House of Bishops is capable of converting the Assembly into a voice of righteousness. They are a small and compact body. They could dynamite the whole smug concern if they had a mind to practise such iconoclasm.'

It gives us little satisfaction to recall that the *Modern Churchman* never supposed that the measure of 1919 would or could give 'Life and Liberty' to the Church of England. We pointed out that it would probably bring about disestablishment, disendowment and disruption, and that, in the interval before the crisis arrived, it would increase the power of the bishops and the influence of the Anglo-Catholic party. There is nothing in the history of the Church since 1919 which indicates that our gloomy forebodings will not be ultimately realized. There is only one body in England which can prevent it, and that is the House of Bishops, and so long as they are appointed by the Crown we do not despair.

As for the Church Assembly, there is no use in dynamiting it, and it is very difficult to see how it is possible to reform it at present save in the way of reducing its expensiveness. Nations and communities get the governments they deserve, and the Assembly is undoubtedly representative of the *practising* membership of the Church of England to-day. Unfortunately that practising membership is drifting further and further away from

the centres of national life and enterprise into a quiet ecclesiastical backwater. The Church Assembly can only become an instrument of Life and Liberty when the Church itself is an agent of Life and Liberty. To become this the Church needs to achieve important doctrinal, educational and liturgical reforms which it seems to us at present it has neither the courage nor the will to undertake. When these reforms are achieved, then the tide of national life and activity and enterprise will begin to flow back into the National Church and find in it a spiritual home.

Another Abortive Attempt at Reunion.

A bombshell was exploded in Anglo-Catholic circles by the presentation of a report at the recent session of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. This report, consisting of over a thousand pages dealing with closer relations between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, was drawn up by a committee representative of both Churches.

Scotchmen are not temperamentally disposed to undervalue any of their possessions, whether national or personal, and Presbyterianism is one of them. If the English Church is to have reunion with the Church of Scotland, it must accept that Church exactly as it is. If the Church of England be willing to do that, then the Church of Scotland is ready for the closest relations. This is the purport, in a nutshell, of the one-thousand-page report. Considering the way in which Archbishop Laud and some of his episcopal successors treated the Scottish Presbyterians, we feel that it shows a good deal of restraint on the part of the Presbyterians not to demand that we shall put away our bishops before they take us to their arms.

It will surprise none that the *Church Times* does not take our view of the matter. It asserts that in this report 'the whole theological position of the Anglican Communion is given away with both hands' (leading article of June 1), presumably on the ground that the Presbyterians do not profess the Christian Faith in the terms of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, but have a preference for the Westminster Confession interpreted in a modern manner. Yet they affirm their 'reverence' for the two creeds named as 'classical declarations of the faith and doctrine

of the Church.' Presumably their reverence does not extend to the Athanasian Creed, but in this respect the Presbyterians are at one with the Episcopal Church of America, which is in full communion with the Church of England. The Presbyterians appear misguided enough to regard themselves as 'members of the Catholic Church of Christ,' but the *Church Times* sternly replies to this claim :

> 'Baptized Presbyterians are members who have repudiated, or at best failed to implement, their membership in that body.'

So far as the *Church Times* and the party it represents is concerned, this report was dead before it was born. Why then have we who are Modern Churchmen called attention to it? It is to point out that so long as Anglo-Catholicism dominates our English Church policy, reunion or even closer relations with any of the Reformed Churches is rendered impossible. If the Church of England is Anglo-Catholic in her temper and policy, then the only reunion proposals to be entertained are those which will *eventually* lead the Church of England into the Church of Rome. To discuss any other form of reunion proposals is waste of time and energy. It may be argued that Anglo-Catholics welcome warmly reunion with the Old Catholics and the orthodox Eastern Churches. This is undoubtedly true. But there is reason to believe that they value these reunions primarily because they believe they will in the end be the most effective way of securing entry into the Roman Church without an act of abject and humiliating surrender.

What, however we need, possibly above all things at the present time, is home reunion, the reunion of all English-speaking Christians within the broad domains of the British Empire. Any other forms of reunion are of little worth compared with this, and in this matter of reunion it is essential that first things should come first.

We venture to think that certain underlying assumptions are doing much to hinder the cause of reunion. It appears to be assumed that the different separated communions, before intercommunion can take place between them, must be in agreement on a great number of doctrinal issues and ecclesiastical methods. This may be desirable, but is it necessary? Bishop Lightfoot said on one occasion, in memorable words, that if a few things

were 'right and tight' for him he didn't trouble about the rest. The vast majority of English Churchmen, if they desire reunion with Presbyterians, do so not because they are in agreement with Presbyterian theology. If they are acquainted with the Westminster Confession it will seem to them to contain many doctrines with which they do not agree. As for Presbyterian orders, English Churchmen feel that they are really no concern of theirs. The Scottish Church has evolved them in response to its national and religious needs. If English Churchmen desire, as many of them do, inter-communion with Presbyterians, their reason for desiring it is that they feel they are fellow-Christians, and that as fellow-Christians they have no right to be separated in their Christian worship.

The Gospel of Modernism.

We are glad to observe that *The Gospel of Modernism*,* by R. D. Richardson, is attracting the attention which its sincerity and spirituality deserve. In the April issue of *Theology* a review of it opens thus:

> 'This is an attractive book. It reveals an ardent religion, God-centred, deeply spiritual, firmly set on devotional, institutional and moral foundations. It is positive and constructive in message, and its intellectual quality is high. If Mr. Richardson's "Modernism" is to be taken as the standard of that commodity, there will be few who will not treat it as a religion deserving sincere respect.'

So generous a review in what is regarded as an English Catholic magazine gave pain to readers whose Catholicity is of a narrower type. As a result, Canon Newell Long wrote complaining to the Editor of *Theology* that the volume had not been unsparingly condemned on account of its departure from traditional orthodoxy. The Editor of *Theology*, the Master of the Temple, in the June issue deals in an extremely interesting way with Canon Long's complaint. He holds that it is not the function of a reviewer of religious books to act as Grand Inquisitor, but rather to provide *data* from which the reader of the review may form his own conclusions. In short, what the Editor demands from his reviewers is competency, not a nose for heresy.

* Skeffington. 3/6.

As for the plea that writers of theological books must be judged by the standard of orthodoxy, the Editor asks: What is orthodoxy? — but not at all in the spirit in which Pilate asked: What is truth? He answers his question with a very interesting definition of orthodoxy:

> 'Orthodoxy is the earnest desire of a communicant to believe as faithfully and to understand as clearly as he can what the Church of his Baptism, being a part of the Catholic Church, and holding in her hands and constantly appealing to the Bible, teaches as true.'—(From *The Parson's Defence;* pub. 1912.)

The Editor furthermore points his readers to the example of Bishop Gore, who claimed to have been both a life-long Catholic and a life-long Freethinker.

This editorial exhibition of sweet reasonableness by an Editor of unblemished orthodoxy is in interesting contrast to the spirit with which the Editor of the *Church Times* approaches the question of Mr. Richardson's book. He writes:

> 'It is to be assumed that the churchwardens and representatives of the Parochial Church Council of St. Peter's, Harborne, were consulted by the Bishop of Birmingham before he appointed the Rev. R. D. Richardson to that desirable living, and it would be interesting to know if the churchwardens have studied Mr. Richardson's book, *A Gospel of Modernism,* in which he rejects the doctrines of the Virgin Birth and the Empty Tomb. As Canon Long has pointed out, since Mr. Richardson has not been censured by ecclesiastical authority, but, on the contrary, has received gratifying reward, he may fairly claim that the teaching—his rejection, that is, of fundamental Christian doctrine—is legitimate in the Church of England. Are the people of St. Peter's of this opinion? If they are not, they should express their mind clearly and without delay. But the matter is of far more than parochial importance.'—(*June* 1.)

It has since been publicly stated that the Churchwardens and Parochial Church Council were consulted beforehand by the Bishop, and that they unanimously welcomed Mr. Richardson.

OUR ENGLISH UZZAHS AND THEIR 'AUTO DA FÉ'

By the EDITOR.

UZZAH feared greatly for the Ark of God and he strove to save it from falling, but he did this in the wrong way, and as the Hebrew Scriptures narrate,

> 'God smote him there for his error; and there he died by the Ark of God. And David was displeased' (II *Sam.* vi, 7 *f.*).

And so Uzzah has become the type of those who, filled with fear, attempt in the wrong way to protect the sacred things entrusted to them.

What is known as the 'Liverpool Cathedral Controversy' reveals that we have a number of English Uzzahs, and not least in the Upper House of the Convocation of York, and that their Ark of God is Nicene orthodoxy expressed in Nicene terminology. On June 7 the Upper House of the Convocation of York, after Dr. David, the Bishop of Liverpool, had pleaded eloquently in the name of Christian fellowship and charity for that practice which would permit the inclusion of Unitarians among those who might be invited to preach at non-statutory services in the Church of England, passed, 'without a dissentient vote,' the following resolution moved by Dr. Henson, the Bishop of Durham, that henceforth no one belonging to any

> 'denomination which does not hold the common Christian Faith in Jesus as "Very God of Very God, who for us men and our salvation came down from Heaven and was made man,"'

should be permitted to speak in our English cathedrals and churches.

The death-bed conversion of Talleyrand, Prince of Bénévent and *ci-devant* Bishop of Autun, was said to have given more joy to the Court of Rome than to the angels in heaven, and we cannot but feel that the recent *auto da fé* of the Upper House of the Convocation of York, of which Dr. David figured as the victim, will give more joy to our English Uzzahs than to Him who taught us to value love and freedom, and the character and conduct which proceed from them, above all verbal professions, including even those which affirmed Him to be the Lord. That

uto da fé is in the same category as Uzzah's transgression. It is ot so much a sin as an error. It is an attempt to protect Chris- ian Truth by the wrong means—means which appeal to the atural man but not to the spiritual man, who is unable to feel hat the spirit of freedom, truth and love stands in need of a olicy of suppression and exclusion if it is to maintain and xtend its influence among mankind. But, unlike Archbishop ranmer, we do not look to the next General Council of the hristian Church to affirm this verdict, but to the historian of *The ecline and Fall of Organized Christianity*.

No doubt some of the Bishops of the Northern Province ere induced to come to their decision by the reflection that f the Church of England pulpits at non-statutory services were pened to Unitarians, it might prove difficult to know where o stop in this extension of the 'liberty of prophesying.' Dr. enson, clad in the armour of logic, asked in a brilliant and erverse speech:

> 'Why should a liberal Jew like Dr. Claude Montefiore, or a Hindu Tolstoyan like Gandhi, be excluded?'

nd we, taking up his challenge, ask, Why not, if they have a essage of moral and spiritual truth to deliver? And who elieving in the universality of that Divine Word which en- ighteneth every man coming into the world, will dare to restrict he operations of the Spirit of God to those who are able to make rofession of their religious faith in the terms of the Nicene reed? All who have read Mr. Redfern's sermon and Dr. Jacks' hree lectures (published in *Elemental Religion*) delivered in iverpool Cathedral, must recognize the Divine Spirit speaking hrough them.

There seem to us to be three fundamental errors underlying he decision of the Bishops of the Northern Convocation:

(1) The error that moral and spiritual truth of the highest rder can only be spoken by those who affirm their religious faith n the terms of the Nicene formula. The Philosophy of Religion an demonstrate the utter falsity of this conclusion.

(2) The error that truth stands in need of such artificial and umiliating protection as episcopal licensings. These repressive egulations are as essentially un-Christian as they are out of date. Englishmen who support them have not only Uzzah for

their father, but Dame Partington for their mother — she who became famous by her redoubtable efforts to keep back with her broom the Atlantic ocean from invading her cottage. They have not only the pre-scientific type of mind, but also what we should call the pre-*Areopagitica* type of mind — a type of mind which John Milton was wrongly supposed to have driven into the underworld of obscurantist fanaticism and mediaeval backwaters by the publication of his famous essay. How utterly puny and futile such episcopal restrictions must seem in the face of such a declaration as the following :

> 'For who knows not that truth is strong next to the Almighty. She needs no policies, nor stratagems, nor licensings to make her victorious ; those are the shifts and defences that error uses against her power : give her but room . . .
>
> And though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licensing and prohibiting, misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood but grapple' (*Areopagitica*).

(3) The third error which underlies this resolution of the Northern Convocation is its low estimate of the intelligence of the English public. We are living in an age and country marked by a rising standard of public education. Our bishops as a body, alas ! are far from being, as was the case a couple of generations ago, among the best educated minds in that public. As for our clergy, we know that unfortunately their intellectual standard has fallen in relation to that of the best educated of their parishioners. Under these circumstances there is a great temptation for religious teachers to fall back upon ecclesiastical authority as a protecting fortress within whose wall they withdraw with the Ark of God, 'which goes out no more to war against the Philistines,' and thereby give the disastrous impression that they are unable to engage the opponents of the Christian religion on equal terms.

What could do more to strengthen the declining influence and attractive power of the pulpit of the National Church than the admission into it of great moral and spiritual teachers selected, not because they represent this or that religious denomination, but selected simply because of their sheer pre-eminence? Need we who really believe in the truth of the Christian religion fear for its victory under such circumstances? And ought we who believe in what one of the Fathers of the Christian Church called 'the human soul naturally Christian' to

doubt that it will be led, if it be sincere and courageous, to make the right choice, even in the clash of conflicting utterances? Our Bishops seem not to realize that they are dealing with those who regard themselves not as children, but as adults, and who demand the right to hear all sides of truth and decide for themselves. By deliberately refusing to permit such a wide range of pulpit utterance in the non-statutory services of the National Church, the Bishops indicate that they neither understand nor trust that public which they desire to win to loyal Church membership.

We really feel ourselves unable to believe that all the Bishops who voted for this resolution could have been convinced of the fundamental rightness of their action. One of the Bishops at least would appear from his speech to have been in doubt. Yet why did he vote for the resolution? We believe that a most detrimental policy is being accepted in episcopal circles which leads Bishops to feel compelled to vote as one body on all important issues, even to the suppression of their right, not only of private judgment, but of individual utterance. This policy which transforms the *Collegium episcoporum* into a *Grex episcoporum* —where every episcopal sheep follows his ovine brother—must in no short time lower enormously the prestige of episcopal utterance. How much more confidence should we feel in the courage and mental vigour of an episcopal body which even on the most important issues was divided?

When Archbishop Benson told his little son, Hugh, of the courage of the schoolboy who alone knelt down and said his prayers in the presence of all the other boys in his dormitory, and asked, 'Was not that brave?' Hugh replied, 'I can think of something braver. A dormitory of bishops in which one refused to kneel down and say his prayers.'

We regret to be compelled to condemn as an offence against the Divine Spirit of Freedom, Truth and Love the deliberate and considered decision of our Northern episcopate in the case of the Bishop of Liverpool. Our defence for such public censure must be that of John Knox, to whom Mary Queen of Scots put the question, 'By what right do you, John Knox, censure and condemn the sovereign and nobles of this realm?' To which the Scottish Reformer replied, 'By the right of a subject born in the same.'

OUR NATIONAL VICE

By Rev. H. G. Mulliner, M.A., Vicar of North Stainley, near Ripon, Yorks.

GAMBLING has become our national vice as drunkenness was the vice of our forefathers. The moralist may here discern progress! The new vice is more intellectual and less boorish. In this paper, however, the ethical debate will be ignored and the discussion confined to gambling as a social phenomenon with particular reference to the recent Government Bill.

I.

From the evidence laid before the Royal Commission on Lotteries and Betting (1932-3), gambling has become widespread among all classes, involves an appreciable re-distribution of the national wealth, and has some noticeably bad social results. Some figures, mostly from the excellent Report of the Royal Commission (1933) will give substance to these generalizations. The most popular forms of gambling to-day are horse-racing, football pools, dog-racing, newspaper competitions, and sweepstakes. (1) The Racecourse Betting Control Board estimated in 1929 that the probable annual turnover of betting on horse-racing was £230,000,000. At a conservative estimate there are over 750 street bookmakers in London without counting their agents and runners. (2) In April 1934, the promoters of Football Pools announced that in stamps and poundage on postal orders, the Postmaster-General received £5,500,000 a year from their Pools. (3) The postal authorities reckon they similarly receive about £3,000,000 a year from newspaper competitions. (4) There are about 220 greyhound racing tracks. The chief association for this form of racing has fifty-eight affiliated clubs at which were made some eighteen million attendances in 1931. Their accountants put the totalisator betting on these tracks alone at £8,000,000 a year; in addition there is the betting with bookmakers who attend the tracks and sometimes number 200-300. It is admitted that dog-racing tracks would not have been started and could not continue without betting.

(5) The Commission estimated that of the total subscribed to the Irish Hospital sweepstakes in 1932, nearly £10,000,000 came from this country.

In considering the significance of these figures it must be remembered that what some call 'the Englishman's right to put a bob on his fancy' must be fairly frequently exercised before we have to think in millions of pounds. Nor may we forget either the numberless small sweepstakes, lotteries, and raffles, or the gambling on the Stock Exchange and elsewhere. The last-named example of the gambling propensity was not within the Commission's purview, but it is interesting to observe Mr. Roosevelt seeking powers to curb such gambling as a thing injurious to the economic well-being of his country; here it is merely cited in support of the contention that the gambling habit is widespread among all classes. In the Commission's judgment the turnover to-day is 'much greater than at the beginning of the century' and 'a larger proportion of the turnover than at any previous time is represented by relatively small bets from the poorer classes of the community.' The Commission speak of 'serious social consequences.' These are not surprising. The unpleasant truth is that a vast number of our fellow-citizens cannot afford to spend money on amusement, good or bad; their weekly income has to go on rent and rates, food and clothing, and sometimes is not enough for these things — as the industrial Christian Fellowship has stated, after careful inquiry, in their pamphlet on *Unemployment and the Subsistence Level*. Hence if even quite a small sum is lost in gambling, the result is impoverishment with its attendant evils. Then we have 'a most pressing problem in the large towns.' Besides the evils of poverty, there is quite good evidence that gambling losses lead at least a few to the greater evil of crime, while in a larger number there is marked deterioration of character. A secretary of a Mile End Club for young men told the Commission:

> 'I should never have thought that any fresh custom of our people would have had such bad results as this gambling. There is nothing in its favour. They are all disgruntled. It is making them loungers.'

To balance these evils — of which the Commission felt the gravity — the gambling habit brings no corresponding gain except that a number of people have passed the time in a com-

paratively innocent way. There is no moral or intellectual good associated with gambling as there is, in some degree, with other popular national amusements.

II.

What are the causes of this increase in gambling? The Commission signalled out the part played

> 'by the increased facilities afforded for organized gambling and by publicity in the Press and elsewhere.'

In a strong sentence they wrote:

> 'Our concern is that we see before us the mass exploitation for private financial gain of the instinct or propensity to gamble.'

The exploiters reply that they only give the public what it wants and there is reasonableness in the answer. The interesting question is whether this public demand is simply the universal propensity to gamble, springing from the desires for amusement, gain, and risk, or whether there are factors in our social order which make a good growing-ground for this propensity.

The question is interesting but also difficult. Three suggestions may cast a little light. (1) The motive of gambling, like that of drunkenness, is, in part, the desire to escape from life: the bet stimulates dreams of what may be done — if one wins. It may be the wild dream of escape into a higher social class or a prosaic dream of a wireless set or a holiday abroad, and those whose lives lie in drab surroundings and are passed in monotonous toil, need dreams. (2) The 'new leisure' and mechanical uncreative work have resulted in many persons regarding amusement as the *summum bonum*. Gambling is both an amusement and with luck a way to more amusement. (3) Yet it is probably the love of money which makes gambling so popular. In our society wealth is the great means to more security, independence, comfort, social prestige, and not only amusements but excellent pursuits as well. The ordinary man sees little hope of these good things by the way of merit and effort, for his employment is uncertain and the prizes are for the few. He also sees the wealth of society distributed on no moral principle and is increasingly and uneasily aware of that fact. To suggest to him that it is wrong in principle to obtain money by a method of chance would probably be met with the rejoinder that he daily sees wealth obtained by less reputable methods. Gambling,

after all, is only part of the scramble for wealth. It is the moral disease of an acquisitive society.

III.

It was not the function of the Commission to suggest remedies, other than gambling legislation, which, though important, can only deal, on the argument of this paper, with symptoms rather than causes. The Commission did suggest that the remedy may lie 'in education, particularly as regards the better use of leisure, and also in the provision of better social conditions.' At present our educational system may be accused of having made the spread of gambling possible by stimulating enough intelligence to use the technique of gambling and enough imagination to prefer a dream of betterment to the drowning of sorrows. Radical changes in the system will be required if it is effectively to inculcate the right use of leisure. Slow though improvement in this respect must be, it is clearly one of the fundamental remedies for the gambling habit. At the same time it may be doubted whether much progress will be made towards the right use of leisure until the majority have work into which they can put themselves, for only then will they demand amusements into which they can put themselves too, and gambling will become as dull to them as it is to those of us already more fortunate in our work. The third remedy is a truer attitude to wealth which will attach more value to its right use and less to its mere possession, and with this change of attitude must come a closer correlation between wealth possessed and services rendered, between merit and reward. These remedies involve vast social changes, but they are already in men's minds. It is not, of course, suggested that in such a changed social order there will not be those addicted to gambling or that the little flutter will not be common, but widespread gambling, which to-day constitutes a social problem, will have passed. The new social atmosphere will no longer be favourable to the growth of this particular vice.

Meanwhile the Church has a clear duty to speak of the evils and dangers of gambling and to seek and to save those who, to their spiritual as well as their financial loss, are gripped by the habit. The habitual gambler is a notoriously difficult subject

for pastoral ministrations, but there is no need to exaggerate the sin — if it be a sin — of the little flutter. Christians can be better employed in proclaiming Christ's teaching about wealth to a generation largely ignorant of it, and in applying that teaching to their own conduct, personal and corporate. In this matter the Christian witness is strengthened by the growing insistence on straight giving for all Church purposes. Nor should Christians lose sight of the fact they are a part of the social life, favourable to the growth of gambling, and are concerned to transform it into the Kingdom of God as well as to save the individual.

IV.

The development of a national habit will usually require some legislative regulation, and gambling is certainly no exception. The recent Government Bill — at the time of writing before the House of Lords — is an attempt to regulate some parts of the field and to do more than regulate. The Commission drew a distinction, which the Archbishop of York made in evidence before them, between private gambling between individuals and facilities for organized gambling, and they expressed the view that 'organized gambling facilities should be prohibited or restricted where these facilities lead to serious social consequences.' The Government appear to accept this principle not without some anxiety, for it requires them to govern, a duty not popular with democratic governments. Our politicians have sometimes a very proper regard for the liberty of the subject, and are usually extremely shy of moral issues. This shyness is partly bred of bitter experience, partly of confusion of thought. From some political utterances one gathers that morality is wholly a matter for the individual conscience and declares things to be right or wrong, white or black: it is therefore no concern of the politicians, who also fears a challenge to combat the 'black thing' with all the power of the state. Thus he confines himself, 'as a practical man,' to questions of public order and social well-being as though these high ends had no connection with morality! This confusion of thought weakens the Government case, for they fail to treat gambling as a question of public morals to be dealt with after due consideration of the principle of freedom, and they deeply perplex the pro-

moters of Tracks by declaring in the same breath that they do not question the Englishman's right to bet but propose to restrict Englishmen when they provide their neighbours with facilities to do so. The Government position is perfectly defensible if they would say frankly they regard excessive betting as a manifest social evil, and they therefore propose not only to regulate it for the sake of public order but also to restrict and discourage it for the sake of the national well-being. This seems in fact to be the official view, clouded by confusion of thought and by a very reasonable hesitancy as to whether this or that clause in the Bill will prove wise and practicable. But their attitude gives rise to the reflection that much in our political situation calls for a government which, with due consideration for liberty and with a strong sense of the realities, will have the courage to govern, as the occasion demands, on the basis of the recognizable principles of public morality.

The Commission, with good reason, recommended the amendment and consolidation of the whole law in regard to gambling. This great task the National Government have refused. In particular they have left on one side the whole problem of street betting. The police admit that they cannot enforce the Street Betting Act of 1906, that it opens the door to corruption, and that they find themselves up against the public. This common defiance of the law is probably a more serious social situation than the growth of the gambling habit, and it is much to be regretted the Government have not tackled this question, difficult and controversial though it is. The Commission were against the obvious solution of Cash Betting Offices, but recommended postal cash betting, and by a majority only, facilities for the deposit of bets in a bookmaker's letter-box. The reasons for the Government's refusal of this scheme are not known. A possible reason is that the increase of betting on dog-racing may lead to a decrease in street betting on horses and so to an altered situation.

The Bill authorizes local authorities to control tracks according to the terms of the Bill, which limits the number of betting days, permits the attendance of bookmakers and compels owners of tracks to distribute all the proceeds of a totalisator, except not more than three per cent. In Part II of the Bill the law against

large sweepstakes, foreign or domestic, is strengthened, notably forbidding Press information about them. On the other hand small lotteries in connection with an entertainment or confined to members of an ordinary club or to those who live or work on the same premises are permitted under rules. Newspaper competitions which do not depend on a substantial degree of skill are prohibited. Particular criticisms of these proposals would be out of place in this paper. Taken as a whole and within its subjects, the Bill is a good example of British compromise in the face of conflicting interests and views. While making certain prohibitions and restrictions among the manifold forms of gambling, it leaves ample facilities for betting, subject to a control which should do much to eliminate fraud and minimize exploitation.

Its restrictive side is naturally unpopular with those whose financial interest it is to promote the spread of gambling. The growth of a vested interest in gambling is no good thing. Possibly science has come to our rescue. The invention of the totalisator makes it possible to bet without the services of a vested interest. Unfortunately the totalisator is peculiarly open to fraudulent manipulation, and some regard it as likely to increase betting. The first objection can, the Bill implies, be overcome by statutory supervision, and the second is possibly only a first effect. In the long run the impersonal machine may prove a deterrent to betting; it does not cry its odds or exhort men to vain hopes, and by its means a very few men can do the work of many bookmakers. The multiplication of the controlled 'Tote' and the elimination of the bookmaker may be a sound line of public policy, though the present Government has not even gone as far as the registration of bookmakers proposed by the Commission. After all the bookmaker can hardly complain if he suffers the fate of many of his clients and is eliminated by the machine.

There is a further advantage. Unlike the bookmaker the 'Tote' is easy to tax, and since the State is recognizing and regulating betting, it is a fair subject for taxation. It is a pleasant thought that the Entertainments Tax might be replaced by one on gambling. Cheaper theatres and dearer betting would be a slogan for all intelligent citizens.

THE MEANING OF MODERNISM*

By Canon Harold Anson, M.A., Vicar of Tandridge.

MODERNISM has been defined as a philosophy of Catholic experience or practice distinguishing what is life-giving and permanent in beliefs and usages—what saints have lived on. It tries to reconcile this with modern knowledge. It demands, not that the great truths of the Christian religion shall be given up, but that they shall be considered afresh in the light of growing knowledge and re-stated in a way suitable to the intellectual conditions of the age.

When doubt is expressed concerning any doctrine of the Faith there are two alternative lines of defence which are taken up by different types of mind. The Traditionalist will say, 'This doctrine has always been held by the Church throughout the ages, and on that ground must be true.' The Modernist will defend the doctrine by urging that the historical evidence is cogent and that on theological grounds it has a claim to our belief. These lines of defence are characteristic of these two types of mind.

The Roman Catholic Church represents the true type of Traditionalist temper of mind. That Church proclaims that, when once a dogma has been defined by the Church, it cannot again be doubted, nor can the question of its veracity ever again be raised by the faithful without sin. The Modernist, on the other hand, will argue that it is quite possible that a dogma, held throughout all ages by the Church, may conceivably have to be modified or abandoned, in view of the finding of modern research. The Traditionalist will, indeed, often give a most learned defence of traditional faith: but his reason for believing the doctrine in question is not really affected by his defence. If you could controvert entirely his reasoning, he would still believe, on the ground that the Church was pledged to believe, and that the Church could be misinformed was incredible.

Let us consider some types of the Modernist mind. We may go back to Abraham, who, acting probably on ancestral tradition, was persuaded that he was divinely inspired to kill his son.

* Notes of a sermon preached at St. Edmund's, Lombard Street, in January, 1934.

When he was about to put in practice this ancient faith, he had, as we know, a fresh inspiration to sacrifice a ram in place of his son. This again was probably condemned by all the religious authorities of his day, and he would never have had the courage to carry through so great an innovation if he had not already been bold enough to leave his father's house and country, and worship the ancestral god in a land which had not known such worship before. Consider again the Modernist outlook of the great Hebrew Prophets. They had been brought up, like all other religious men of their day and country to believe that God desired the killing of bullocks and goats as a means of serving Him. All the authorities of their day believed that this sacrifice had been divinely ordered. It was part of what Traditionalists to-day call 'the faith once for all delivered to the saints.' The Prophets, however, declared that not only did Jehovah not desire the sacrifice of animals, but that He had never ordered it, and that the only demand that He made on the human heart was that men should deal justly and walk humbly with their God. In saying this the Prophets did in reality overthrow the whole Jewish system of worship, which had hitherto rested on a supposed basis of divine authority. But the Prophets, divinely inspired as we believe, had come to realize that doctrines and practices approved by the whole Church of their day were no longer required by God, and, in fact, in spite of all tradition to the contrary, had never been required at all.

But the greatest example of the Modernist approach to religion is to be found in the teaching of Christ Himself. Our Lord was able to say that He would not remove one jot or tittle from the Law, and yet at the same time so to undermine the structure of the Jewish ceremonial and sacrificial system that wherever His word held sway the whole system crumbled to the dust. The Jews might very well have objected that it was contrary to the truth for Jesus to teach that He had come to fulfil and support the Law when in fact He had brought it to an end. The overwhelming defence of Christ's attitude is that the ceremonies of the Law had in themselves no value except in so far as they sub-served the basic object of the Law, which was to promote the love of God. Christ stripped off the whole ceremonial of the Law, and so revealed that in it which was essential and eternal.

So we find that in the teaching of the Apostles almost all the rules and ceremonies of the Jewish religion, which had been for many generations based upon divine sanction, such as the Sabbath, animal sacrifice, circumcision, the distinction between clean and unclean meats, were all done away in Christ; and yet the Apostles could argue with truth that it was they, and not the Traditionalists, who in reality were upholding the Law of God. It is indeed true to say that if it had not been for the Modernist attitude of St. Peter when he admitted Gentiles into the full Communion of the Church, and did away with the distinction between clean and unclean meats and touchable and untouchable races, the Catholic Church could never have come into being at all. Catholicism rests upon Modernism, the modernism of Christ and His apostles, drastically applied to the ceremonial and dogmas of the Jewish Law.

Let us take another illustration from the Reformation. It had been universally held in the Church up to that time that it was not permissible for the clergy to marry after ordination. The reformers, however, following Our Lord's teaching that regulations were made for man and not man for regulations, believed that it was more in accordance with the will of God to cancel this regulation in accordance with the experience of the Church, and they therefore permitted for the first time that persons already ordained might be allowed to marry. Another curious instance of the Modernist spirit is to be found in the Roman Catholic Church, which, in the fifteenth century, so far modified the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in a very essential part as to forbid the laity to receive the element of wine in the Eucharist. There are very few Modernists to-day who would venture to suggest so revolutionary a practice as this, resting as it did on no tradition of any kind.

But it is in our own day that the Modernist spirit has been most clearly felt as an element in Church life. This is due mainly to the vast extension which has come about in the last two generations in regard to our knowledge of comparative religion, and the growth of what is known as the Higher Criticism of the Bible. We are able, to an extent which has never before been possible, to judge what part of the Christian tradition really comes from Christ, and what part is due to pagan traditions or to

the growth of local customs and superstitions. We are hence in a position to be able to set free, in a measure which has not been possible before, the Spirit of Christ from the growths which have almost inevitably grown up round it and very largely concealed it. We are able also, by exact comparison of the various traditions represented in our four Gospels, to see what the influences have been which have tended to raise up an elaborate structure of belief round the original story of the Gospel.

The growth of this historical spirit of enquiry has tended to throw doubt upon some of those dogmas which have hitherto been held to be an essential part of the structure of Christian belief. The most notable instances are the supernatural birth of Jesus, the physical resuscitation of Our Lord's material body from the tomb, and the verbal infallibility of the Bible. Whatever may be the eventual outcome of the controversy round these doctrines, Modernists feel themselves quite free to hold that they need not be regarded necessarily as essential doctrines of the Christian Faith, and that those who feel unable to accept them as historical facts may be just as loyal and whole-hearted members of the Christian Church as those who do feel able to accept them as statements of history.

Modernists are often regarded as people who reject the miraculous on *à priori* grounds, being unwilling to accept evidence for that which is unusual or unique. Modernists would vehemently deny that they have this *à priori* objection to the miraculous; but what they would say is that, in the words of Baron von Hügel, 'There is a great difference between what we would like to be true and what is true, and we can never afford to forget this distinction.' A man who is quite willing to believe on quite simple evidence that his neighbour has seen King George V driving in the park, would be quite justified in demanding an infinitely stricter degree of evidence if he were asked to believe that Henry V had been seen leading his troops down the Mall. The Modernist does not deny that there may be many events which are beyond our present experience, and yet may be perfectly true and even very important: he only says that, however valuable these beliefs may be as myths, they cannot be taken to have historical value without such a measure of evidence as would be expected in honest scientific enquiry.

The Modernist would not deny the value of myth. There is very much to be learned from the story of Hamlet, and much to be learned from the man who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho and fell among thieves, even if we could never prove that such persons actually existed. But we should agree that the Church has no right to ask people to accept as historical fact an alleged occurrence for which there is no adequate historical evidence. The tradition in question may still have an important value as a dramatic explanation of a doctrine, but, however great its value emotionally, that does not make it to be a fact of history. It may have a very honourable place in a creed as an illustration of a belief in itself valuable, though no longer to be based on the same alleged occurrences.

We claim, then, that Modernism has always been an essential factor in the growth of the true Church. Unless received dogmas are being continually criticized in view of the growth of modern knowledge, the Church can never hold the allegiance of people who are sincere. There is a very prevalent belief that the Church is not greatly concerned with truth, but is much more concerned with giving people comfort based on grounds which are often untrue. Unless the Church cares a great deal more for truth in the future than it has in the past, it is difficult to believe that it can survive.

Lastly, let us remember that while the critical spirit is a very essential element in the healthy growth of the Church, it is not the main or principal element. God has hidden His greatest secrets from the wise and prudent and has revealed them unto babes, and it is good for the Modernist to remember that it is not to the intellectual or the critical that God reveals those secrets on which the religious life is truly based. The critical spirit of Modernism is a cathartic or cleansing spirit; it cannot be dispensed with in a healthy religious life, but religion is not based upon it. It is the holy and humble man of heart who most truly pleases God, and it is the pure in heart who most clearly see Him.

A CAROLINE PREACHER

IT may help us to see our author's purpose in truer perspective if he be suffered to describe in his own words the moral state of the generation he is confronting.

> 'This age,' he says, 'exceeds former ages in sinning . . . The Devil's mint is going every day, and sin is minted faster than money . . . If all who have the hearts of beasts had the faces of beasts, men would grow scarce. The spirits of men are leavened with Atheism and their lives stained with debauchery. I know not what to call them but Baptized Heathens. There is a generation among us of whom I will say with Oecumenius, they militate against Religion; they are so prodigiously prophane that they esteem the Bible a fable . . . One is possessed with a spightful Devil, another with a blasphemous Devil, another with a drunken Devil. This is one great sign of the approach of the last day; iniquity shall abound (*Matt* xxiv, 12) . . . Sin hath brought our nation low. We are cadent if not morient. There is a spirit of wickedness abroad in the land. Ours are mighty sins (*Amos* v, 12); bloody sins (*Hos.* iv, 2). The sins of Denmark, Spain, France and Italy are translated into English; we have many Sodoms among us and may fear to have the line of confusion stretched over us. By our impieties and blasphemies we have sounded a Trumpet of Rebellion against Heaven. Were our sins engraven on our foreheads, we should be ashamed to look up . . . Plainness is ever best in beating down sin — when a wound festers it is better to lance it than to embroyder it with silk or lay Vermillion upon it. Reader, that God will bless these few Meditations to thee and make them operative upon thy heart shall be the prayer of him who is thy friend, studious of thy eternal welfare.
>
> THOMAS WATSON.'

This melancholy picture of seventeenth century morals forms part of the preface to *The Mischief of Sinne, It brings a person low*, one of Watson's later works. There lies open before the present writer a copy which was given by the author, shortly after publication, to a certain Mr. Jowson, an event which the latter deemed of sufficient importance to record on the title page, 'Mr. Jowson given me by Mr. Watson July 1671.' So runs the bald entry written in a fluid which has faded to a yellowish-brown with the passage of time. As a relic of old-time religious thought this little work can scarcely fail to have an interest for our own generation. But more than this, its two hundred pages of closely-packed argument form a human document reflecting the mind and outlook of a man of austere piety and of stern unbending character; a man, moreover, whose abilities must have led him to high office in the Church, had he stooped to stifle his

conscience, and as he himself said, 'sail with every wind which blew preferment.'

We are chiefly concerned here with the author and his teaching and only in a minor degree with the man and his career. But forming part of his life-story, as told in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, were three strongly contrasted periods which can scarcely have failed to leave an impress on his outlook. These demand a passing reference. In the first, he is to be found serving a sentence of imprisonment for complicity in a plot to recall Charles II from exile. In the second period, which extended over a decade, we see him a famous and popular preacher drawing large crowds to his church, St. Stephen's, Wallbrook. The Restoration followed and with it his ejectment for non-conformity; then long years of adversity, during which he appears to have displayed characteristic courage, exercising 'his ministry privately as he found opportunity,' and this notwithstanding the rigorous enactments in force against Dissenters.

Watson's literary output was very considerable; the greater part of it has been preserved in the British Museum Library and in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. It so happens, however, that *The Mischief of Sinne* finds no place in the catalogue of either of these famous collections. Thus it may well be that Jowson's treasured possession is the last of its kindred.

From the outset we are left in little doubt as to our author's purpose. In his title and sub-title alike he sounds an unmistakable note of warning; a note which more than once finds an echo in the preface. Especially forcible is an early passage in which he announces his determination 'to give check to sinners . . . to make them return from the hot pursuit of their impieties.'

What then was 'sin' in the eyes of this stern moralist? First and foremost it was to be regarded as 'an act of treason against the Crown of heaven.' It had an ugly sound in those days, that word treason, and Watson uses it advisedly to emphasize the sinfulness of all sin, whether mortal or venial. That the generation he was confronting was perverse and dissolute none knew better than the Caroline divine. Persuasion he had tried but to little purpose; where the shepherd had led the way the wayward sheep had refused to follow. Small wonder if he thinks the time ripe for a gospel of fear. Now he will lay down the staff and

take up the goad. He will try the effect of a 'warm preaching.' It may be that by its instrumentality some among the many stragglers will be brought back to the narrow path which leads to salvation.

A gospel of fear must in the nature of things resolve itself into an exposition of all that is implied in that frigid aphorism 'honesty is the best policy'; in other words, into an appeal directly or indirectly to self-interest, the enlightened self-interest of the hearer. A series of such appeals forms an integral part of our author's method. Hear him in a quaint passage reminding his readers that sin not infrequently brings in its train ill-health and physical suffering.

> 'Sin turns the body into an hospital, it causes feavers, ulcers and catarrhs. Sin brings one low in melancholy; this is *atra bilis*, a black humour seated chiefly in the brain. Some have strange and dismal conceits, fancying their bodies to be made of glass and if anyone touch them they shall break (Baldw. : lib iii, C4 de Cas Consc.) . . . Melancholy doth disturb reason and weaken faith. Satan works much in this temper; it is *balneum diaboli;* he bathes himself with delight in such a person. Through the black spectacles of melancholy everything appears black.'

Here Hippocrates and his theory of humours would seem to have led our author into deep water, perhaps a little out of his depth; for all that, the passage furnishes much solid food for reflection.

To exhibit sin in a fresh light he takes this colourless little word of three letters and transforms it into a series of vivid images.

> 'Sin breaks the axle-tree of Church and State . . . Sin is the Trojan horse out of which a whole troop of affliction comes . . . Sin does to man what Jael did to Sisera, she gave him milk but she brought him low. Sin first brings its pleasures with delight and charms the senses but then comes with its Nail and Hammer . . . Prayer is a sovereign plaster for the wounded soul, but sin pulls off the plaster and it will not heal . . . Sin clips the wings of prayer that it will not fly to the Throne of Grace . . . The soul which was once of orient brightness, the mind angelified, the will crowned with liberty, the affection so many Seraphim burning in love to God, yet by sin is become diseased and this disease brings it low.'

We turn from sin in general to specific breaches of the moral law. In Watson's order of precedence Pride come first. He explains why.

> 'St. Austin calls Pride the mother of all sin . . . Some are proud of their bodies; people spend time between the comb and the glass, which should be spent in prayer and holy meditation. Pride is seen in

painting of their faces, overlaying God's work with the devil's colours. Pride is seen in spotting themselves. Pimples show that the blood is corrupt; spots on the face show that the heart is corrupt. Cyprian saith that they who paint and spot their faces may justly fear that at the Resurrection their Creator will not know them and how terrible that word "I know you not!"'

A further warning against Pride is conveyed in a cautionary tale which a less credulous age will scarcely accept at its face value

'Caelius Rhodiginus reports of an antient woman, who had used flattering glasses, seeing her face in a true glass, she fell mad (*in insaniam delapsa est*).'

Having dealt at some length with 'the mother of all sin,' Watson proceeds in leisurely fashion to thread his way, seemingly at random, through what is in effect an extended Decalogue. With a minimum of comment let us hear some of the arguments he uses to drive home his message.

Another sin which he deems specially deserving of condemnation, is swearing.

'Truly it is a matter for tears that we can hardly go into the streets but our ears are crucified with hearings of Oaths and Cursings. —*ἐκ πολυορκίας φύσλαι ψυδορκία* (*Philo*) . . . For every oath a man swears God puts a drop of wrath in his viall . . . I have read of a German boy who was given to swearing and did use to invent new oaths; the Lord sent a Canker into his mouth, which did eat out his tongue (*in quo quis peccat in eodem plectitur*).'

The following passage anent the growing neglect of Sunday observance is worth quoting if only as an example of Watson's ingenuity in 'citing Scripture to his purpose.'

'This blessed day which is made purposely for communion with God is become a day of perambulation. People frequent the Fields and Taverns more than the holy assemblies. We see men pollute what God himself has consecrated. If they are to take Physick it must be on the Lord's Day; if they are to make feasts or visits, it must be on this day. And so in a prophane sense they call the sabbath a delight (*Isa.* lviii, 13) . . . God threatens (*Jer.* xvii, 27) "If ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the Sabbath Day, then will I kindle a fire." I observe the devouring fire which broke out in London, began on the Sabbath Day, as if God would tell us from heaven, he was now punishing us for prophaning His day.'

In his denunciation of Avarice he becomes epigrammatic.

'When the rich miser dies what scrambling is there; his friends are scrambling for his goods; the worms are scrambling for his body, and the Devils are scrambling for his soul.'

He continues:

'Another sin which has brought us low and is like to bring us yet lower is uncleanness . . . It was said of Rome of old *urbs est jam tota lupanar*. I wish it might not be verified of many parts of this land.'

These few excerpts must suffice. We pass on to the hour of death and the ultimate penalties of sin.

> 'When death comes near a man it changes his opinion about Holiness. He once thought it a shame to be seen with a Bible in his hand. Holiness was the object of his scorn and hatred. He called pious discourse canting; repentance, whining; praying by the spirit, babbling; he baptised true zeal by the name of Phrensie. But when death begins to approach, it changeth his judgment; he now sees how he was mistaken . . . The wine which showed its colour in the glass and smiled at him, now bites as a serpent (*Prov.* xxiii, 32). Those sins which were thought light as feathers, now are as talents of lead ready to sink him . . . Sin brings a man without repentance to the bottomless pit and then he is brought low indeed.'

The belief in Hell as a place of torment situated somewhere within the fiery interior of the globe would seem to have raised no serious doubts in the minds of the theologians of the early Church. Tertullian for one is nothing if not explicit . . . 'Hell,' he says in *De Anima*, 'is a place within the earth—*Infernum est locus subterraneus*.' Here he is but following Virgil, with whose works he would most probably be acquainted. Virgil, it will be remembered, writing in the century before the Christian era, had placed the entrance to the pagan Underworld on the Phlegraean Plain under the shadow of Vesuvius. A sinister region this Phlegraean Plain, as the present writer can testify; a region of poisonous gases and jets of hot vapour; a region of volcanic fires and liquid brimstone bubbling up through the fissures in the rocks. Beneath the surface deep down under the crater of the great volcano lay Tartarus, the hell of the ancients and not improbably of the author of the *Second Epistle of St. Peter*. Here were punished those who had committed heinous crimes when on earth. In a neighbouring section Virgil seems to be anticipating the later Doctrine of Purgatory, for Aeneas on his journey through the Underworld is described as meeting with some 'whose guilt is being burnt away by fire' with a view to their ultimate regeneration.

Thus the Latin poet. Quite apart then from the legacy bequeathed to Christianity by Jewish eschatology, the way had been paved for what was to become the traditional doctrine of everlasting torment. For our present purpose, however, it matters little how far pagan ideas had influenced the Church in general or Tertullian in particular. It is enough that Watson quotes Tertullian's dictum and makes it abundantly clear that

it has his whole-hearted approval. In the capable hands of the Caroline divine the *locus subterraneus* of the fierce African controversialist becomes a veritable Chamber of Horrors.

> 'The torments of hell shall be in every part of body and soul . . . The eyes shall be tormented with the sights of devils, the ears with the hideous shrieks of the damned; the tongue, which is fired with passion, shall now have fire enough . . . So dreadful is all this that the most tormenting pains, stone, collick, strangury, are but pleasures to it . . . Here the wicked thought a prayer long, a Sabbath Day long, but how long will it be to lye in hell for ever, *vestigia nulla retrorsum* — the pains of hell are without intermission, what would the damned give for one hour's sleep.'

With a brutal frankness worthy of an age of frankness and brutality he continues:

> 'They (the saved) rejoice though it be in the damning of their own relations . . . The father will not pity his child in hell, nor the wife her husband . . . God the father will not pity them; he will laugh at them. Is not this sad for a damned soul to lye roaring in flames and have God sit and laugh at him?'

A God who will exult over a lost soul in its agony! A more enlightened generation will scarcely recognize in this vengeful Being the God revealed in the gospels; the God who so loved the world . . . the heavenly Father whose will it is that none should perish. To our author, on the other hand, this base and ignoble conception of the Deity appeared 'entirely reasonable,' indeed he scarcely pauses to justify it save by a passing reference to a verse in the first chapter of the Book of Proverbs. And Watson, be it remembered, was no unlettered street-preacher suddenly carried away by a wave of unreasoning emotion. On the contrary, the old Cambridge student not only bore a reputation for wide learning, but he would seem to have expressed himself with more than ordinary care and deliberation, to judge by the plethora of quotations and marginal notes in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew with which the argument is overloaded. Nor can the studied brutality of his eschatology be attributed to lack of Biblical knowledge, for he knew both his Old and New Testament almost by heart. Clearly then we must look a little deeper, or at least a little further afield for the explanation. The plain fact is his mental equipment was, in the main, an inheritance from the distant past, a legacy of which he was unable, perhaps unwilling, to divest himself. But if justice demands that a generation be judged by the light it has received, how much more so the individual. It must not be forgotten that

Watson was living some three centuries nearer to primitive barbarism than the present-day theologian. And the closer the age in point of time to the cave-man the greater the likelihood that its beliefs and customs will contain elements which are hostile to the spirit of Truth. Only then by introducing a measure of 'relativity' into our ethical judgments can we hope to appraise, with any degree of accuracy, a complex character of the past, whether it be an Augustine, a Torquemada or a Caroline divine.

We enjoy a welcome respite while Watson discourses on Penitence and other aspects of his theme. Then a sudden fear would seem to have assailed him—had he failed to make the ultimate penalties of sin sufficiently deterrent?—for he returns to the charge in a closing chapter, a parting shot as it were. The title in itself is sufficiently ominous, 'The fornace heated hotter or a fuller description of such persons as shall have a greater share in Hell's torments.' And here the once popular preacher shows himself singularly human, for among the first to be sentenced to the 'greater damnation' are those

> 'Who will neither hear a good sermon themselves nor endure that their neighbours should . . . If the heathen who have never heard of Christ are damned, these shall be double-damned.'

He continues:

> 'The coolest part of hell is hot enough but there are some that shall have a hotter place in hell than others . . . Those whose impieties are more fearfully accented God will take his full blow at in hell and tear them in His wrath (*Ps.* 1, 22). For such he will heat the infernal furnace seven times hotter . . . Nothing will convince them but fire and brimstone.'

A score of pages of fiery invective, then seemingly exhaustion, for the human vocabulary has its limits. Abruptly he brings his gospel of fear to a close, entreating the reader to put on 'the garment of our Lord's righteousness,' adding in conclusion the significant reminder that this is a garment which 'the fire of Hell cannot singe.'

There will be some who, as individuals, will perhaps hold up their hands in horror at the sustained brutality of Watson's eschatology. Be it so. But collectively can we of this generation in strict logic assume towards it the self-complacent attitude of the Pharisee of old? Do not the 'damnatory clauses' of the *Quicunque Vult* abide with us to this day and still form a part of the Church's confession of faith?

GEORGE RAINEY.

THAT THEY ALL MAY BE ONE*

By the Rev. J. F. Bethune-Baker, D.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in Cambridge University.

'That they all may be one.'—*Jn.* xvii, 21.

IN the great prayer which has this as its chief petition a distinction is drawn between 'the world' and the men and women in it who, in any age, are brought to see in Jesus the manifestation of the one true God of all the world—His Name, His characteristics (*v.* 6, *ἐφανέρωσά σου τὸ ὄνομα*). It is an ideal for Christians among themselves 'that they all may be one'—'even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us . . . that they may be one, even as we are one.'

That the prayer as we have it is the evangelist's own composition is clear, but that it is a true reflexion of the mind of Jesus we cannot doubt. What seems to me worth noting is that by the time the prayer was recorded there was need to proclaim the ideal as persuasively as possible: the evangelist had in view a need of the young society. The wonder of the new experience of which Jesus was the centre had already found different kinds of expression. Different descriptions of it which could crystallize into historical facts and theological definitions were current. Good practices with religious intention were becoming conventions or sacred institutions. Convenient arrangements for the decent order of affairs in the various groups of believers were having the authority of apostles or of the Lord Himself claimed for them. Already there were many groups; ecclesiastical organizations and systems of doctrine were in the making.

As for doctrine, in the very act of writing his Gospel the evangelist was himself putting out a new interpretation of the significance of Jesus. The oneness which he thought was in accordance with his Master's mind clearly allowed of various ways of conceiving Him: it did not demand one only formulation—a single creed. And as to organization, in the allegory of the Good Shepherd, which deals in story form with the same conception of unity, it is not one fold but one flock that the one shepherd wants. Those that are his, given to him by the Father,

** A sermon preached in St. Andrew's, Ashley Place, S.W.1, at the Annual Meeting of the M.C.U., May 30th, 1934.*

may be distributed in many folds on earth—yea, even in heaven, in the Fathetr's house 'there are many mansions' waiting to receive them—while yet they all may be one.

We know, indeed, that Jerome by his change of *una grex* to *unum ovile* in the Latin version which became the Bible of the Western Church, and Augustine by his use of the mistranslation in his conflict with some early puritan schismatics, have a heavy responsibility for the 'one-fold' theory that prevailed in the West. But already before their time uniformity of creed, with technical definitions that only specialists can understand, had come, and uniformity of order was already regarded as the divinely appointed channel through which alone a true religion here and eternal life hereafter could be obtained.

As we look back on those far-off times, the early years and on through the middle ages, it may well seem to us that only so in all the changing conditions of the world of those days—only so could Christianity have survived and kept such kind of identity as it undoubtedly has preserved. At all events it was the 'one-fold' theory that gave us the continuity we have, both outward and visible and inward and spiritual. It gave us, first, as our criterion of the Christian faith the New Testament—that great treasury of different points of view from which we can always quote some text wherewith to confound our opponents, till they quote another for us to be confounded in turn. It gave us our glorious heritage of Christian literature in which, in every age, I suppose, we can find something that makes us feel our spiritual kinship. However far forward we have moved to-day, whatever ideas of the past we have discarded with growing knowledge of the world that is for the moment our world and has always been God's world—of all the pain and travail and adventure of which we are the outcome—yet as we read the Christian literature of almost any previous age, bizarre and strange and uncongenial as so much of it is, we feel that we are in the same religious tradition, lawful heirs and trustees of it.

'To get to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou didst send.

'Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.'

'. . . who loved me and gave himself for me.'

'To be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace.'

'Thou, O God, didst make us for thyself, and the heart of man is restless till it finds rest in thee.'

'Rock of ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in thee.'

These are notes that are re-echoed all down the ages, and where they are silent we miss a characteristic unitive Christian experience. It is not mere sentimental emotion but the fine flower of mind and heart in personal expression.

When we pass beyond description like this to reasoned doctrines and definitions, of course we come to what is not unitive but divisive.

The results of the one-fold theory in the formulation of order and explanation have been the disruptions and disunions that have set Christian so-called against Christian all the world over. And it is because this same theory seems still to possess the official mind of the Churches of Rome and of England that recent conversations and discussions about re-union are watched by the rank and file of all the English communions concerned with indifference or disdain and resentment. The kind of re-union that seems to be in view is based on a false conception of unity. It is the ecclesiastical mind that must be converted, if the mind of Christ is ever to rule in the churches of Christendom. How the call of the Christ comes to us to-day– μετανοεῖτε all ye Christian ecclesiastics, clerical and lay alike. Get a new point of view. Must ye for ever, in these matters, be tithing mint and anise and cummin?

I suppose we should want to answer, But O Master! Master of the things of the spirit, the abiding things of worth, must we not still pay heed to these things, for we are still on the plane of this world? Is it not true, 'On earth the broken arc, In heaven the perfect round'? In Thine own little band of twelve was there not organization, an inner circle of three (Peter and James and John, who all gave us creeds of their own), and one with a money-bag, the business man of the band who wanted to make a public success of Thy cause? Surely it *need not* have been just he who betrayed Thee?

We cannot help it. Creeds and institutions we must have, and systems of doctrine to answer, however lamely, the questions of that spirit within us by which alone we are human but which

we believe is also 'the candle of the Lord.' Only when it is well trained and instructed can we avoid 'profane and idle babblings' in our discourse of high things. We know it is 'in his heart' that the Christian must 'sanctify Christ as Lord,' but he is also bidden to be ready always to give a reasoned account concerning the hope that is in him (I Pet. iii, 15). I do not think he can do this to-day, any more than he could seven or seventeen centuries ago, by a selection of bits of description from the New Testament. Something more reasoned than that seems to me to be required in our present environment of thought and knowledge and our search for a coherent conception of human experience as it is spread out before us to-day.

For my own part, as least in the statement of my creed, I cannot let go the great findings of the past in the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity. I do not mean the popular conceptions of them in terms of a sudden miraculous intrusion from outside or of three individual centres of consciousness. These conceptions I suppose we all regard as modes of valuation that are out of date, or examples of the high mythology dependent on human analogies with which Religion gives, as it were, flesh and blood to its otherwise dumb convictions. And we should add that, in so doing, in the case of these doctrines it testifies to the fact that they are based on actual happenings on this homely earth of ours and the actual experience of men and women like ourselves.

But the fundamental idea of Incarnation, as it can be presented to-day in the light of our view of evolutionary, epigenetic, process, and the idea of the Trinity as our Christian philosophers have portrayed it, seem to me to define the lines along which we reach the true interpretation of human life and history. We may recognize some kind of Christian sentiment and aspiration, some kind of Christian direction of life, where these ideas are wanting. But if there be a theology that excludes them, or even ignores them as indifferent, I at least cannot deem it a 'Christian' theology or believe that it could in itself suggest the Christian conception of man and the world and God, and so direct us to that fulfilment of ourselves in all our relations with one another that our old theologies call the redemption of ourselves and the world.

'My flesh that I seek in the godhead, I seek and I find it.'
'Nor soul helps flesh more now, than flesh helps soul.'

That the human is the organ of the divine; that the flesh, the material, is the means of expression of the soul, the spiritual; that the eternal is realized in and through the temporal, the one only in the many and the many only in the one, unity in diversity and diversity in unity — these ideas, of which our doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity are the classical expression, are achievements of the human spirit in vital connexion with early Christian experience that has been continuous to this moment. They must, I think, remain as the very core of our Christian Creed. It is failure to uphold them that has led to the 'profane babblings' and the -isms of the past and the present.

Yet surely we ought to have learnt by now that of all the detailed schemes of doctrine, as of all the forms of order, that have been devised no one can be binding on all Christians. In our own Church of England we have gone farther than this. We know that even within a particular fold, a particular Church, variant conceptions of its institutions and widely different interpretations of its formularies and doctrines have existed and can exist. Ever since the Reformation — that age of spiritual giants and watchful statesmen — it has been so. To keep us both Catholic and Protestant was the aim of our sixteenth century divines. Our new Catholics of to-day dislike the word Protestant, but I do not believe that their leaders really have a narrower aim. In any case, as far as we can discern the genius of the Church of England and the religious tradition of the English people, it will never be confined in any narrower conception of ecclesiastical order and institutions than our Reformation settlement reflects. Rather it will seek a still wider catholicity to embrace its world-wide dispersion and the many other races whose special contribution to the interpretation of the Gospel it seems to be its destiny to welcome and honour with its own.

The new revelation of knowledge of the world and the Bible and the beginnings of the Christian religion has already spread its light among ourselves. The older ones of us here could point to landmarks and crises in its course of not much more than seventy years. I recall to-day one of the last of these crises, just twenty years ago. The new number of *Theology* which came to

me yesterday reminds me of it. A great leader of the Church flung down a grave, if somewhat petulant, challenge to the methods of study pursued to-day wherever Truth is the aim. There was much talk about the 'historical facts of the Creed,' the 'literal' and the 'legal' construction of its clauses, and a mixture of literal and symbolical interpretation. A new phrase appeared, the 'religious construction,' which could be applied to all clauses alike; and it was claimed that in such religious construction only could continuity of Christian faith be found and maintained. To-day, as far as my own experience goes, it is only in such religious construction of our Creeds that educated men and women have any interest.

So in these great matters of the re-interpretation of ancient creeds, of free historical and scientific enquiry, and of refusal to be tied by old beliefs, our fold has shown itself to be one with expanding walls. And it is the peculiar concern of 'modern' Churchmen, of all generations and of all schools, to see to it that the walls never close in on them in these respects. They will do so always, of course, with the 'sweet reasonableness' which is the mark of Christian strength and the 'meekness and godly fear' of a good conscience. I suppose that means with courtesy because they are sure of their ground, keeping their tempers, even when their opponents 'furiously rage together' and 'imagine a vain thing.' And they will do so in full confidence that, however far short they fall in other respects, in this they are true to their Master's ideal—true to the ideal of the one-ness of the flock for which he prayed.

In the world as it is, with its rich varieties of types of human personality and ways and means of expression, there may well continue particular modes of presenting the common Christian conviction, our Christian Faith. Particular folds may remain. And to-day there are many who are not in any fold whom yet, it may be, the Shepherd of the flock knows as His own. For somehow they hear His voice and know Him as their leader; in heart, if not in mind, they recognize in Him the manifestation of the one true God and the way of life for mankind. And the heart, which has its own reasons, guides them to find no narrower fold than the human society to which we all belong. In it, in service to their neighbour, they set forth the ideals of Christ and in their

own way worship His God. Between them and Christians who can be labelled there is a real unity of spirit, and perhaps we must be content with that. But if between others who stand in conscious relation to the same Master ecclesiastical statesmanship cannot find the way to visible intercommunion, it must be because it is distracted by irrelevant interests and aims, and has not learnt, even yet, the meaning of the prayer 'that they all may be one.'

BOOK REVIEWS

A GREAT CHRISTIAN PREACHER*

There are distinct signs of an awakening interest in a method of evangelization long neglected or belittled, that of a well-reasoned sermon from the pulpit to a congregation which may be assumed to be both reasonable and appreciative. Dr. Jacks, in a series of six lectures on the Lyman Beecher Foundation, addressed primarily to preachers, but equally suitable for those who are preached to, reviews not only the accepted traditions of the pulpit, but also what seem to him to be the modern needs of both teacher and taught, the methods most suitable for meeting them, and the difficulties most likely to be encountered. Realizing that for too long a milk-and-water preaching has been both advocated and applied, he maintains from the first a higher and more courageous note:

> 'The preacher will be well advised to address his congregation on the assumption that I am now making in regard to you. Assume that they are composed of brave men and women, and assume it especially in regard to the young. You will not fill your churches by appealing to the love of comfort, ease and safety. You are far more likely to empty them. One of the reasons why so many churches are empty to-day is that the appeal has been pitched too low.'

The preacher's difficulties arise less from the fact that he is confronted with a modern and almost unknowable world, than that the Church's position of authority, and his own as a representative of the Church, has at present little clear definition either in its own mind or in that of other men.

> 'There was a time when the churches of Christendom held not only the religious and moral leadership of the Western World, but the intellectual leadership as well, when the great leaders of thought were either Churchmen or men who did their work under the Church's influence and guidance.'

Men who felt the call of the spiritual and intellectual life answered it as ministers of the Church. To-day there is, perhaps, no lack of leaders in thought; the difficulty is rather the lack of people who are willing to follow the leader when he appears. It is here that the preacher encounters at once his greatest difficulty and his greatest opportunity. In an age which calls for leadership, only to criticize and despise it when it appears, all the art of the preacher must be brought into play so that he may not only lead, but lead in such a way that he encourages and satisfies those who follow. This

* *Elemental Religion.* By L. P. Jacks, M.A., D.Litt., LL.D., D.D. (London: Williams and Norgate, Ltd. 1934. 4/6.)

he will bring about by appealing only to such authority as may well be found within the experience of the congregation. But experience there must be, and it is about this essentiality of experience, or knowledge of God, that Dr. Jacks is at once most stimulating and most profound.

> 'It is a sound principle that if we are in search of religious experience we should look for it not in regions to which we are strangers, but in the very heart of the life we are leading. If that be the intellectual life, let us look for it there. And since the life of a student is predominantly an intellectual one, he has the right to expect that the Living God, if present anywhere, will be present in that.'

To ask questions about God, His nature, His power, His very existence, is not to question faith or to deny revelation, but is using reason to gain experience, that kind of experience which is most worth while, which is indeed the only kind worth having. And it is this experience which the preacher will seek, through his own personality, to communicate to his hearers.

> For '. . . the truth of the Living God always demands, in the last resort, and behind whatever other means may be employed, the personal presence of the revealer. Its vehicle is always a person — and a person not hidden, not anonymous, but known, felt and even loved as a person by those to whom his word is addressed — an outstanding truth to which the whole history of the Christian religion bears witness, standing as true to-day as it did in the times when printing and all our other impersonal means of communication were unheard of, as true to-day as it was when Jesus spoke to the multitude in Parables or Paul addressed the Athenians from Mars Hill. In this revelation of God the ultimate force of the appeal will always reside, not so much in the word spoken as in the man who speaks. That may not be so with the revelation of other things: but it is always so with the revelation of the life of God.'

In the last lecture, 'The Preacher and the Rising Generation,' Dr. Jacks has many wise things to say. For him the problem is not so much how the Church is to retain her young people, but how religion may best use our new world in dealing with those who are at once its creators and its children.

> 'The Churches have no monopoly of the Holy Spirit. They may construe its action, but not control it.'

Wherever, therefore, the Holy Spirit is to be found in our age it must be recognised, it must be given full play. The preacher's cry therefore should not be 'Back to the Apostolic Church!' but 'Carpe diem!' When the proposal is made to return to primitive Christianity, we find when we get there that we are foreigners in time. We carry with us the memories of all that has happened to Christianity since the age when it was primitive; and of that, needless to say, the primitive Christian knew nothing.

Those who talk of the Church as being to-day on trial, or of its having arrived at the last ditch, find little to confirm their opinions in this book, for its author points out, only too plainly, that the alarmist is always with us. The preacher, if he has courage, has still the opportunity, perhaps greater than ever before. But if he favour self-expression, and would encourage the young in that line, let him make sure that the self he is bidding them express is their real and true self, and not an artificial, false self which merely imitates the fashion of the time. It is here that religion will help him, for it is religion in terms of self, which alone is communicable.

For a man's self is the sum of his experience, and it is for the Church to make the fullest use of the saint in the pulpit, for by giving his self, his experience, he gives a religion, a life also.

The volume concludes with the three sermons, delivered in Liverpool Cathedral by Dr. Jacks, which figured in a recent controversy. The titles are 'The Holy Ghost,' 'The Holy Catholic Church,' and 'Death.' In each we find a great Christian preacher abundantly putting into practice the advice he has given to his students in his lectures. It is at least noteworthy that amid all the clamour which the delivery of these sermons occasioned, no single voice was raised to question the matter therein contained. The first two sermons are models of the treatment which, it may be hoped, their subjects shall receive not many days hence from more 'orthodox' preachers. Of the last it is sufficient to say that it inspired us to an immediate re-reading of Maurice Pryke's ever-fresh 'Modernism and Life after Death,' with which it has so many affinities.

The book is not only a key to the life and thought of an outstanding modern Christian preacher, but should also prove an invaluable handbook to many who are called to the ministry of the Word. When rural deaneries meet to discuss the art of preaching they could not do better than adopt *Elemental Religion* as the basis of their discussions. J. R. Bateman.

RED MEDICINE*

It is commonly assumed that the ideal Socialism which some advocate from a Christian point of view is sufficiently condemned by a reference to the condition of Soviet Russia under the Bolshevik *régime*. It is implied that Russia, once a fair place, silently contented and supremely religious under a paternal Czar, has become a hot-bed of discontent, anti-religious and immoral, since the Revolution. The old, very rotten condition of things under Czarism is forgotten.

Recent investigations show the fallacy of this contention, and prove that in very many ways the Soviet *régime* is a marked improvement on the old order in Russia and a model for other nations to follow. It may indeed be that the fearful anti-God movement is really at root a Christian development; at all events many of the improvements that Christian-Socialists would bring about at home are already in being in Russia — as child welfare, full and free education from the nursery schools to the universities, care of maternity cases with treatment before and after child-birth, and universal, free, and complete medical treatment for all classes and conditions of the people, with hospitals properly equipped and all doctors provided and paid by the State.

All who are vitally interested in social work and desire a better social order in England are indebted to the publication of this remarkable book, written after a complete and impartial investigation, by Sir Arthur Newsholme, K.C.B., M.D., and John A. Kingsbury, LL.D., Secretary of the Milbank Memorial Fund, under whose auspices the investigation was made possible. It is the first comprehensive study of socialized medicine under the Communists. The authors, both already recognized as authorities in their fields, declare categorically that the Soviet social ideas have definitely assisted in providing a complete medical and hygienic service. Maternity cases, pediatrics, social insurance, abortion, training of doctors, tubercu-

* *Red Medicine.* By Sir Arthur Newsholme, K.C.B., M.D., formerly Principal Medical Officer of the Local Government Board, and John A. Kingsbury, LL.D., Secretary of Milbank Memorial Fund. (Published by Doubleday, Doran & Co., New York.)

losis, venereal disease, and health and education on a large scale are dealt with in detail. Modern Churchmen will at least be convinced that there is much to learn from Soviet Russia from a Christian point of view. The book is a revelation and a challenge, and it cannot be ignored.

We cannot get away from the fact, the awkward fact for many, that what Russia has accomplished in its courageously original schemes for the health and social well-being of its people constitutes a challenge to other countries. Dr. Fosdick recently interpreted the significance of this challenge when, speaking of Communism and its relation to America, he said: 'The only methods by which the United States can prevent its adoption is to display equal efforts in a drive for social reform . . . these Communists in Russia really are on fire with sacrificial and determined zeal, at all costs, even at the cost of ruthless persecution, to build what seems to them a more decent society, and the only way we can ultimately compete with them is to be equally zealous for social reformation. What if in the end these atheists in Russia should turn out to care more for building a better social order than we Christians in America do? That is the moral crux of the competition between us.'

No words can better force us to face the facts, arouse us from neglect of the issue, and induce us to read carefully what *Red Medicine* can do for our social life. The authors of the volume urge that 'this vast and fascinating experiment in socialized health may not turn out so well as its originators expected, or it may turn out better. In any case it is an experiment that the rest of the world cannot afford to ignore.'

H. J. PALMER.

ORIENTATION*

Metaphysics is a necessary evil. To find one's bearings is essential but not always simple. In travel, orientation is to determine the East; in metaphysics, orientation is to determine what is basic. When what is basic is known, it is more possible to distinguish what is secondary or illusory.

The authors of both these volumes fear that science has led popular thinking to believe that matter is basic and that, in consequence, human values are ultimately of no significance. Their enquiry has naturally two stages. In the first place, to show that it is pointless to remain incarcerated in a materialism which science has abandoned, especially as in any case science now explicitly states that her judgments differ in nature from metaphysical judgments. And in the second place, to outline a new metaphysic founded on a study of experience wider than that known to the selective attention of science.

After a full and informed discussion of the collapse of classical scientific materialism, and the misunderstandings which led to its rise, the essential conclusion of both volumes may be stated in the words of Dr. Parsons, that science 'now admits that it can give us only a symbolic representation of reality and leaves us free to give such interpretation of the mysterious background of experience as we may wish' (p. 86). But, as in other cases, the real difficulties begin after leaving the prison gates. Both are determined to begin a reconstruction, not on some hypothetical material basis of our experience, but on a synoptic study of our experience itself. Both seek a ground or background for our experience, and both agree that their

* *The Universe of Our Experience.* By L. M. Parsons, D.Sc. (Williams and Norgate. 1934. 7/6.)

Science and the Spirit of Man. By J. W. Friend and J. Feibleman. (George Allen and Unwin. 1934. 12/6.)

ground or background may be described only in terms drawn from our experience. But a similar starting point does not mean a similar destination. Dr. Parsons examines several modern conceptions of the background of experience, and in his most confident moment claims 'that a spiritual interpretation of the universe, with all such an interpretation implies, is not only open to us, but is definitely indicated as the only interpretation that can be considered at all adequate' (p. 157). The value of this book lies, not in its material or conclusions, for which originality is not claimed, but in the clarity, breadth and temper of the discussion. Owing possibly to a naturally optimistic outlook, the problems of dysteleology are not very adequately traced, and it would be valuable to hear more of the 'spiritual interpretation' and its relation to traditional Christian interpretations.

The authors of *Science and the Spirit of Man* are far more ambitious in their reconstruction. They contend that the popular distinctions between the self and the external world, and in the external world between primary and secondary qualities, are misleading. There is neither an independent self nor an independent world. 'Basically, all is one and there is no discontinuity' (p. 29). What, then, in our experience discloses the nature of the basic unity? No single aspect of our experience is the real, but some experiences reveal more of the inclusive meaning of a situation. The experience of Truth, Beauty and Goodness gives some insight into the 'infinite value' which is the stuff of the universe. Mystic experience is not supernatural, but the most inclusive knowledge. It may be an inability to rise above the familiar, but for many readers the distinction will remain between judgments of existence and judgments of value; and when personality is reduced to 'a fictional distortion in the basic unity' (p. 322) many will also fail to understand how value can survive personality. In brilliantly attacking a scientific cosmology which tends 'to belittle man and all human values,' they appear, in spite of protestations, to do the same, but not in the same way. It is, however, a stimulating and virile book because the authors have achieved more than a verbal rejection of the conventional world picture.

G. F. Woods.

THE STUDENT MOVEMENT*

It is impossible to understand the religious situation throughout the world to-day without a grasp of the part played by the World Student Christion Federation of which the Student Christian Movement is the representative in Great Britain and Ireland. Those who are interested in the position of Christianity as a world religion or in the religious situation in these islands cannot afford to neglect this instructive study of an important movement which constitutes such a vital factor in the contemporary religious outlook. The value of this book lies in the fact that it is written by the only person who is qualified to write it, one who himself since his own student days has played a leading part at the heart of the life and thought of this movement throughout almost the whole period of its existence. The result is not a dry-as-dust historical record of committee meetings and resolutions, but a warm, glowing, sympathetic account of the growth of the Student Movement as a living organism. It is rich in memories of the great personalities who guided the Movement in its younger days, many of whom now serve in distant lands, or who have since occupied high office in their own churches, or who have passed over to the other side. There are

* *The Story of the Student Christian Movement.* By the Rev. Canon Tissington Tatlow, M.A., D.D. (S.C.M. Press. 1933. 12/6 net.)

many delightful photographs of the men whose names have been prominent in the Movement from C. T. Studd to Robert Mackie: not the least interesting of these are the portraits of the youthful 'T' himself. Many personal reminiscences and anecdotes bring us into living touch with past heroes of missionary and social endeavour. The far-reaching influence of the Student Movement upon the world is also dealt with in the book: this influence has been enormous. The contribution of the Movement to missionary enterprise in the twentieth century cannot be over-estimated, nor can the value of its contribution to the work of Christian Reunion. Its influence upon questions of religious education, international relations and social amelioration has also been very great, and all these points receive due consideration in Canon Tatlow's book. Those of us who have learned much from the Movement and have come to cherish it and its ideals will be sincerely grateful to Canon Tatlow for his fascinating history; but others who are interested in contemporary religious questions and movements will also find themselves indebted to him.

ALAN RICHARDSON.

THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION*

This Essay is described on the dust-cover as 'a fresh examination into the meaning of the Holy Communion in the light of the most recent research . . . a development of the view of the late Dr. Kennett that the metaphor of the Paschal lamb lies behind the Words of Institution.'

This view alone, it is contended, explains adequately the events in the Upper Room and gives due weight to the background of the scene, the annual Passover festival. This view alone can reconcile Paul's apparent inconsistencies: he did not hold an *ex opere operato* theory, yet he did regard 'the bread as in some sense the body of Christ and the wine as His blood,' but, it appears, 'only in a figurative and symbolical sense'—symbolical of the Paschal Lamb. This view alone will explain the application of 'Lamb' to Christ in New Testament writings, while the crude phrase 'eat his flesh' in the eucharistic discourse (Jn. vi) appears quite natural when brought into relation with the Paschal victim.

Yet not only do 'references to the Holy Communion alike in the New Testament and in the Early Church' exhibit 'a real unity' when viewed from this angle, but 'Dr. Kennett's theory in fact gives a strong support to the traditional Anglican and Free Church view' as found in Richard Hooker. For the 'strange theories, such as Transubstantiation, or Consubstantiation, or the Anglo-Catholic view of an objective but unexplained presence' are due only to 'ignorance of the true meaning of words.' We are indebted to Dr. Kennett and Mr. Maxfield between them for dispelling our ignorance; in fact, the 'theory is a great gain to the Church which will one day be recognized,' but is it so new as it is made to appear?

The following points in this book may be of interest: the Synoptists do not necessarily imply that the Last Supper was the Passover, Mark's dating being due to a confusion of Jewish and Roman reckoning of time: the Last Supper was the Passover Kiddush, and not the Passover itself: the longer text of Luke is preferred to the shorter: the Mystery hypothesis is discredited.

The book is never inaccurate, but throughout one has the feeling that it is the work of a writer who is seldom thoroughly at home with his material. Thus, Dr. Oesterley's name alone appears in the chapter on

* *The Words of Institution*. By T. H. W. Maxfield, M.A. (W. Heffer and Sons, Cambridge. 1933. 3/- net.)

Kiddush, and one might imagine that it was he who first identified the Last Supper with this Jewish fellowship meal: the reference for Mithraism not exerting widespread influence in the Roman Empire until quite late is Archdeacon Hunkin's essay in 'The Evangelical Doctrine of the Holy Communion': while the footnote on the chapter 'Holy Communion in the Fathers' reads, 'The quotations from the Fathers in this chapter are taken from Prof. H. M. Gwatkin's *Selections from Early Christian Writers* and the *Hasting's Dictionary of Religion and Ethics.*' What one might be led to expect from such honest admission is borne out to the full in the flimsy treatment accorded the multitude of highly-complex points which are raised all through.

There is a little irregularity in the printing of the reference numbers: *e.g.* on p. 50, chapters 10—16 should clearly read x.16; on p. 51, chapter V should read v; on p. 53, I Peter 1—19 should read i.19, to conform to normal practice; while the footnote figure [1] on p. 20 has been omitted. Otherwise the book is well got up and pleasing to read.

HEDLEY F. D. SPARKS.

EVANGELICALISM YESTERDAY AND TO-MORROW*

The Church of England has seen, in the three centuries following the Reformation, the rise of three great parties. Of these, the Evangelical Party may claim that the story of its rise is one of abiding interest. Its gospel was a simple Gospel of the Atonement, and it managed, in a way in which the other parties were not altogether successful, to touch the lives of the people as a whole. There can be no doubt, as Lecky clearly showed, that morals in England at the beginning of the eighteenth century were at a very low ebb. The populace was, generally speaking, degraded. A vast reform took place, and it is not too much to say that it was due to the devoted work of the Evangelical preachers. The conversion of John Wesley from an attitude in which he looked like anticipating by a century the work of Newman and Pusey into that of the itinerant preacher has a wide appeal for biographers. The message of hope which he gleaned from the writings of Luther was to mean a great deal for the England of his day, and his transmission of it to his friends, 'The Holy Club' at Oxford, was to lead to the rise of 'the people called Methodists.' Together with George Whitefield and others, whose names are all but forgotten to-day, he fired England by his preaching. The sermons of these earnest mission preachers make strange reading nowadays. The chance reader of a volume of Wesley's or Whitefield's sermons will not be thrown into the ecstasy which once seized the crowds who thronged common or market-place in order to hear the voice of the preacher, but the most sceptical of readers cannot doubt that they had a very real message for their day and generation.

They had their quarrels. The controversy which marked off Augustinian from Pelagian, Jesuit from Jansenist, sprang up among them. Selina, Countess of Huntingdon, a 'mother in Israel' to the revival, Rowland Hill and Toplady, fought bitterly for Calvinism against the Arminian Wesley. But there is another side too. The lives of Fletcher of Madeley, or Adam of Winteringham, are lives of which any church in any age might well be proud. Singleness of purpose and an entire lack of worldly guile was marked by a determined fight for truth as they conceived it. Later came

* *A History of the Evangelical Party in the Church of England.* By G. R. Balleim. (Longmans, Green and Co. 1934. 3/6.)
Evangelicalism and the Oxford Movement. By Y. Brilioth. (Oxford University Press: Humphrey Milford. 1934. 5/-.)

such notabilities as Thomas Scott, John Newton, the Milners, and Bishop Porteus of London, the first Bishop to show friendliness towards the despised Evangelicals. Again, one must not forget such laity as Thornton, Lord Dartmouth, or Hannah More. It may be claimed that their crowning triumph was the foundation of the Church Missionary Society in 1799. When the work which that Society had achieved is recalled, it may fairly be claimed that its founders wrought out a tremendous work for the Church as a whole.

The period of the Oxford Movement was the peak of Evangelicalism. It had settled down, and its first fervour was spent. Yet it had become fashionable: its followers met in the wealthy proprietory chapels, so bitingly satirized by Thackeray, and it contributed a solid decorum to English middle-class life. The work of Charles Simeon at Cambridge lived on for many years in the memories of his disciples, whilst the creation of the Simeon Trustees heralded the future of patronage trusts in the Church of England. William Wilberforce had succeeded in carrying the anti-slavery agitation to a successful conclusion — the masterpiece of Evangelical work. But this was also the period of its decline. Its leaders were now embroiled in controversy. Exeter Hall, the rallying point of Evangelical orators, poured forth denunciation, not now merely of worldliness and vice, but of Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman. The rising Oxford school of High Churchmen came much into conflict with the followers of Wesley and Wilberforce. Thus opened the long and dreary story of controversy, the ritual prosecutions, and the attendant bitterness. The Evangelicals seemed to have lost influence, but there was a second spring towards the end of the century. Such names as those of Ryle of Liverpool, Moule of Durham, Christopher of Oxford, still mean a great deal to an older generation of churchpeople, but by the early years of this century the party had passed into a decline. It now became allied with the Low Churchmen, and they joined forces to maintain the Protestant interest in the Church of England.

Such is the story that Mr. Balleim unfolds. He writes as a convinced disciple, and his well-documented book is one of deep interest. It will repay study, for it opens the door to many long-forgotten episodes in the life of the English Church. Much as some may differ from the author's standpoint and conclusions, his enthusiasm for the work achieved in slum and in mission field will carry the reader along to the very last page. Students of the period will find it a useful book.

Dr. Brilioth's little work may be regarded as a supplement to his larger book, *The Anglican Revival*. He studies the background of the Oxford Movement and points out the development in some minds from Evangelicalism to Tractarianism. His claim that Pusey was one of the greatest of English Evangelicals is not to be lightly set aside. Incidentally he gives useful glimpses of the sacramentalist movement in Swedish Lutheranism, a subject scarcely known in England. It is certainly a book to read, for it contains much material which is not easily found elsewhere. It will enhance the already high reputation of its author in the realm of English ecclesiastical history.

Why did Evangelicalism decline? The question is not an easy one to answer. It was not capable of retaining a hold on every type of mind. Newman was educated as an Evangelical. Of Wilberforce's sons, all save one passed over to the Church of Rome, and the exception was 'Soapy Sam,' who became a High Church Bishop. Manning was once an Evangelical rector. The most probable reason was that, in its encounter with Tractarianism, it lacked philosophy and culture. The homely piety of Simeon

and the honest goodness of John Newton were no match for the subtle dialectic which sprang forth from Oxford. In its later days it suffered from a lack of intellectual emancipation. It was never free from its historical and scientific difficulties in the way in which Gore and Scott Holland freed Anglo-Catholicism. Its simple Gospel could not assimilate new theological learning. Jowett and Stanley had ushered in a new era, and the Evangelical movement had not the intellectual equipment with which to meet it. Yet its values were conserved. The school of Liberal Evangelicals have done much to emancipate the minds of their followers and to protect the essential principles of the Reformation. But there is, in the latest form, freedom of thought and toleration. These have carried the Liberal Evangelists far from the position of the old leaders. The movement has not died and will probably continue to influence the English Church, for it has always been a greater favourite with the laity than has Anglo-Catholicism. What will be the standpoint of the Evangelicals to-morrow? The answer lies with the present leaders of the party, who, if they can succeed in fully adapting their message to present-day categories of thought and knowledge, may even now find that they have a great contribution still to make to English Church life.

F. H. Amphlitt Micklewright.

THE THEOCENTRIC EMPHASIS *

Dr. Brown's book is significant. It is typical of the religious thought of to-day, which is becoming more 'theological' than specifically Christian. The reason is not far to seek. The modern temper is out of harmony with ecclesiasticism. Through the gathering clouds bursts the God of Barth.

Though under the influence of Crisis-Theology, Dr. Brown is not exclusively attached to it; on the contrary, in his study of the supernatural (the sub-title of his book) he seeks to show that God is One who everywhere and at all time has made Himself known to men in a variety of ways. With no small measure of success he rises above a misnamed Catholicism to a true Universalism.

The first two chapters of the book provide a valuable discussion of the terms 'nature' and 'supernatural':

> 'In the first place we may understand by nature the physical universe, taking the term in the broadest sense to denote all that aspect of reality which has location in space and admits of measurement by tests which are accessible to the senses. In contrast to this, the supernatural becomes the spiritual. It means the inner world of consciousness, of thought and of appreciation which is known to us only through introspection. Personality in this sense is supernatural, and to say of God that He is supernatural is to say that, whatever else He may be, He is like us in being a self-conscious and self-determining spirit. . . . Another possible meaning of natural is the predictable. In contrast, the supernatural is the novel, the unpredictable, the creative. . . . We mean by nature the actual, as distinct from the desirable or the possible, what is, in contrast to what should be. The supernatural becomes the ideal, the normative, the perfect—in a word, the absolute' (pp. 29-31).

He goes on to discuss how the supernatural is to be observed in human life, dealing particularly with Barth, Anglo-Catholics, Buchmanites, Kagawa and Gandhi.

* *God at Work.* By William Adams Brown. (S.C.M. Press. 1934. 6/-.)

The next section deals with the 'Life of Faith,' and in Ch. 5 the inequalities of religious experience are discussed, but no novel thought is presented. Next comes a brief examination of miracles as viewed by Religion and by Science:

> 'We may define miracle — in the sense in which alone religion is interested in it — as an exceptional event, or quality in an event, in nature or in human life, the significance of which consists in the fact that religious faith sees in it the self-revealing activity of God. . . . A miracle as faith conceives it is not simply a wonder but a sign. . . . These are the four roots of man's belief in miracle: the capacity for wonder, the consciousness of enlightenment, the experience of reinforcement, the longing for certainty; and as long as events occur which arouse this capacity, produce this consciousness, induce this experience and satisfy this longing, we must expect to find men believing in miracles.'

In Ch. 6 the Problem of Evil is stated, not very adequately, and the approach to a solution is extremely vague: 'Religion's answer to the Mystery of Evil is the greater Mystery of Good. Religion does not ignore evil, much less try to explain it away. It does something better. It conquers it. Through religion we are introduced to a good which, stronger than evil, will eventually master it. Faith calls this victorious factor God' (p. 105).

In the discussion of 'where God meets man' we reach one of the keynotes of the book—personal surrender: 'God makes His presence known with irresistible conviction *in the act of the will by which man surrenders without reserve to the highest he knows.*' Summing up what this surrender means, Dr. Brown says:

> 'In their surrender to God, men have found in Him beauty, the supreme harmony that resolves all discords. They have found in Him righteousness, the unchanging law that sets all standards. They have found in Him love, the creative energy that is the spring of all renewal. But the greatest of these is love; for love, and love alone, can bring good out of evil, life out of death, hope out of despair, and can make all things new' (p. 139).

Another long section on miracles goes to showing that the quality in them which gives them their significance in religion lies outside the region of scientific investigation, and it is pointed out that religious conviction is never the result of logic alone—there always enters in a moral element, an appeal to the sense of value, assent involving an act of will as well as of mind. 'The arguments of the theologians are the mistranslation into intellectualistic terms of intimate and immediate experiences' — a fact which many professional Christians seem to forget.

The suggestion made above that religious thought to-day is not specifically Christian is borne out by the fact that of some 250 pages in this book only three deal directly with Jesus, of whom Dr. Brown says:

> 'To Christians the miracle of miracles is Jesus. In Him his disciples see God's supreme and final revelation to our race. Jesus is no isolated historical phenomenon. He made indeed a new beginning, but He built on what others had done before Him, and He left it to others to complete His work. . . . In Him we see God at work, incarnating in a human personality those qualities which appear to us most divine. . . . To the man of faith, Jesus is God's Word to man spoken through man. In Jesus faith recognizes God at work — incarnate for our salvation' (pp. 191-3).

Herein lies the significance and importance of the movement of which Dr. Brown's book is a typical product. Religion is essentially *experimental*; there can be no purely theoretical approach to the knowledge of God, only one path is open—the surrender of the will to the highest we know. God must reveal Himself in action, and that action must take place in us. The value of rational thought is that it clears away obstacles; it can point the way, but the will must respond. This mode of thought is the inevitable outcome of a study of the history of religion and the psychology of the individual, and Dr. Brown is a good, if somewhat leisurely, expositor of it.

G. F. Cope.

HOMELY MYSTICISM*

The London Lent Book this year is written by Miss Evelyn Underhill, and provides, as does the series, an opportunity for the pilgrim to 'drink of the brook in the way.' In this brook the waters run deep. The sunlight plays on its quiet surface; only occasionally it penetrates to the rocky bed of the stream; and more often it is reflected with many colours from the sediment which the mountain stream has collected from its earth banks. But the water is good to drink. The writer not only knows the mystics, but is herself of their company. The Bishop of London in his preface rightly remarks on 'the deep thought and spiritual experience which underlies' the book. If it is not, perhaps, suitable for those to whom the mystic has made no appeal, those who have journeyed a little along that way will find much to encourage them in their pilgrimage and to warn them of its pitfalls. Miss Underhill discusses some of the great affirmations of the Creed—'One God, Creator,' 'Incarnate,' 'The world to come,' are three out of the nine chapters—but it is not theology with which the writer is concerned, but with the realities to which these affirmations are finger-posts. The Great Reality is God, and it is well to be reminded: 'God, not man, is the first term of religion; and our first step is the acknowledgement that *He is*. All else is the unfolding of these truths about His life and our life which this fact of facts involves. I believe in One God. We begin there; not with our own needs, desires, feelings, or obligations.' An inescapable assurance of God runs refreshingly through the book. We stand on the mountain tops, away from the haunts of men, and believe. Yet we see the haunts of men below us with a sharp clearness, and our own past stretching, as it were, behind us. Miss Underhill has a sense of the homely and of the opportunity of the homely. Her mysticism is not of the desert. Nazareth was good enough for Jesus for thirty years, and our Nazareths are all right for us. 'The third-rate little town in the hills, with its limited social contacts and monotonous manual work, reproves us when we begin to fuss about our opportunities and our scope.' In the life of Jesus we see thirty years for growth at Nazareth before the brief period of action, and this fact rebukes us for 'spiritual impatience and uppish hurry.' In these and many ways the writer speaks to our condition, and is perhaps at her best when dwelling on 'the mysteries of Christ's earthly life.' The world of to-day—its motors and by-passes, for example—provide illustrations for the eternal truths of the soul's journey, and help to break down 'the sound-proof partition' which some erect 'between the oratory and the kitchen.' Sometimes the imagery is a little vivid. 'Christ was trained in a carpenter's shop: and we persist in preferring a confectioner's shop. But the energy of rescue,

* *The School of Charity*. By Miss Evelyn Underhill. (Longmans, Green and Co. 1934. 2/6.)

the outpouring of sacrificial love, which the supernatural life demands, is not to be got from a diet of devotional meringues and éclairs.' There is a Catholic piety and there is a Protestant piety: this book is of the former. Here the emphasis is on the divine action on the soul and on the duty of humble self-abandonment. The Protestant would probably maintain a keener sense that God has not created 'selves' that they may be 'abandoned' or 'forgotten,' but that in Him they may become 'new creatures' and enter into 'the life abundant.' Miss Underhill would have us 'cleansed of all self-love,' but is not the word of the Lord profounder, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour *as thyself*'? Be this as it may, this book teaches—or reminds us of—many lessons learnt in that School of Charity which is our life in God.

H. G. Mulliner.

THE PAGAN BACKGROUND TO THE NEW TESTAMENT*

'The coming of Jesus Christ has nothing to astonish when one has read Virgil,' said Sainte-Beuve. Dr. Glover's book (which has certainly deserved to be reprinted in its present attractive form) sets out to show 'something of the society in which the early Church found itself,' and in so doing roams at large over most of the field of ancient history in the years before Christ.

Dr. Glover could not but write an adequate summary of those years. He takes as his starting-points the influences of Greece, Alexander the Great, republican and imperial Rome, and the Hellenistic monarchies. If a critic were to say that the Judaism of the Old Testament and later days receives too curt a treatment, the author might reply that there are many adequate studies of the connection between Christianity and the Old Testament. But he would probably not do so. The chapter on 'The Jew' takes nineteen pages of a total one hundred and eighty-nine. The amount seems to represent his views on the relative importance of Jew, Greek and Roman in the development of Christian thought.

The ancient world was going through a period of helplessness and disillusionment. It was very like our post-war world. Philosophy, whether Stoic or Epicurean, satisfied some of the aspirations of the educated man. But he had lost his gods, and as yet found no new object of worship. The parallel with certain sections of society to-day is obvious. Government had broken down as well. The degenerate successors of Alexander's generals were no loss to an oppressed world: Rome, with all her faults, supplied a better government, a more just system of taxation, and a generally incorrupt judicial system. Government by democracy was dead: government by a single ruler was the only thing to save the situation. New religions, the worships of Isis, Orpheus, Mithras, sprang up all over the Empire. They flourished among the less stable-minded as Christian Science or Spiritualism or the cult of British-Israel or the Four-Square Gospel do with us. Here, then, was the 'praeparatio evangelica.' Greek philosophy supplied the Jews of the Diaspora with a background of pure thought into which the reasonableness of Christianity could well be fitted. Alexander the Great had scattered Greek culture and Greek education over an enormous area. As a missionary of culture he was unrivalled. The practical genius of the Roman, barren of ideas himself, but able and willing to foster the spread of ideas derived from other races, completed the picture. The world was ready for Christianity.

* *The World of the New Testament.* By T. R. Glover. First published 1931. Reprinted in 'Cambridge Miscellany.' (C.U.P. 1933. 3/6.)

In this book the bare bones of modern politics occasionally stick through the flesh and blood of ancient history. Dr. Glover does not fail to express his dislike of the civil service and of bureaucracy, and he clearly has little use for English Public Schools. Some unnecessary and irrelevant hits at them might well have been removed from this reprint. Why will writers so often judge the school of to-day as if it had remained unchanged from the days of their own youth? The book itself (dare we suggest it?) would be of considerable use to a Sixth Form who were not permitted to keep their New Testament in a water-tight compartment. W. H. Oldaker.

A WELL PRINTED NEW TESTAMENT *

This is a reprint of the original edition of 1881, in paragraphs with the chapter and verse numbers printed in the margins, and containing the Preface and Marginal Notes of the Revisers as well as the list of readings and renderings preferred by the American Revisers. The print is good and the binding attractive.

This edition should be in the hands of every boy and girl at school, for however much a 'shortened' Bible may be necessary for the Old Testament, it is infinitely better for the child to read the Gospel story from the Evangelists themselves rather than from a book giving a set of selected passages. It should be used in every Bible class and find its way into every home. While it is printed just like an ordinary book, reference to any chapter or verse is as easy as in the Authorized Version where the text is murdered by being split up into verses — a catastrophe which has been perpetuated in modern editions of the Revised Version in spite of the Revisers' strong dislike of the practice.

It is to be hoped that the reception of this edition of the New Testament will be such that it may be possible to have a similar edition of the Old Testament. R. R. Lewis.

* *New Testament, Revised Version.* (Long Primer, crown 8vo. O.U.P. Maroon cloth, 2/6; buckram, gilt top, 4/6. 1934.)

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of the *Modern Churchman.*

'ELOI, ELOI . . .'

Sir,

In the original sermon about 'Eloi, Eloi' and the letters which followed it, I find no mention of what seems to me interesting and perhaps important; namely the words in Luke's Gospel (xxiii, 45) 'The sun being eclipsed' or 'The sun's light failing.' They occur exactly at the spot in the triple tradition where Matthew and Mark have 'Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani,' which words Luke leaves out. I cannot but feel there is some significance in this. The coincidence (if such it be) is well known to New Testament scholars, but it has evoked little comment. It is agreed that Luke had Mark (or was it proto-Mark?) before him when he wrote this. The relation between the three versions can only be seen in the Greek, thus:

Mt. Ἠλεὶ Ἠλεὶ . . . ἵνα τί με ἐψκατέλιπες.

Mc. Ἐλωὶ Ἐλωὶ . . . εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με.

Lc. τοῦ Ἡλίου ἐκλείποντος.

I feel sure there is some literary connexion between the two things; though how Luke so interpreted his original, it is hard to say. Perhaps he had an earlier draft of Mark, all in Greek except the first word HAEI. Or perhaps he is citing Q. But we may be driven to accept that in our present texts of the Gospels (4th included) there has been a considerable amount of redaction, even in the first or early second century.

DOUGLAS WHITE.

TOWARDS COMPREHENSIVENESS.

SIR,

At our Modern Churchman's Union General Meeting on May 31st I was deeply impressed with Dr. Major's plea for a policy of Comprehension and especially for pressing forward to Inter-communion with the Church of Scotland and the English Free Churches. I am sure that here we have the chance of winning a tremendous victory, because the great mass of English Laity will be on our side, and opposed to any who may protest against us. But I feel that in order to make progress, we must make up our minds definitely on one point. The superiority complex must go. I will confine myself to the Church of Scotland, of which I have some slight knowledge. It is quite hopeless to make any progress towards inter-communion with the Scottish Church on any sort of superiority basis. She claims that her Ministry and Sacraments are every whit as valid as those of the Church of England, and that in every way she is a true branch of the Catholic Church. If we frankly acknowledge the claims of the Scottish Church, and treat her on a basis of equality, I am sure she will grasp warmly our hand of friendship and that the cause of unity will be greatly advanced. I am equally sure she will not tolerate the slightest suspicion of superiority on our part. As Modernists with a policy of comprehension and unity, our course of action—namely a frank admission of equality, should not for a moment be in doubt.

G. F. HANDEL ELVEY.

The Vicarage,
Willingdon,
Eastbourne.

PAMPHLETS IN CHURCH PORCHES.

SIR,

At the Annual Meeting attention was called to the way in which the pamphlets sell when exhibited in church bookstalls. My experience bears this out; we have sold 2,000 copies of pamphlets in the Farnborough Church porch, and visitors still buy what is put up. Should any parish find it difficult to pay for a supply out-right, a supply will be sent from the office, for which payment can be made when it has been sold in the parish to which it is sent.

The Marriage pamphlet by Dr. Helena Wright is practically sold out and, thanks to a grant of £5 from the Eugenics Society, is to be reprinted.

May I express thanks to members who have helped in the past and also the hope that their example may be emulated widely throughout the Union.

R. G. GRIFFITH,
Editor of the Penny Series.

Farnborough Rectory,
Kent.
June 4th, 1934.

THE COMING NATIONAL PEACE CONGRESS.

SIR,

May we urge the active interest of Churchmen in the meetings of the National Peace Congress to be held at Birmingham, June 22—25? We share the view of the promoters of the Congress that the continuing urgency of international affairs and, in particular, the serious situation in regard to the Disarmament Conference, affords every justification for the holding of a National Congress this year. We hope, therefore, that the Churches and their auxiliary organisations will, wherever practicable, send representatives to these meetings and so contribute to that concentration of the peace forces of this country, which is so urgently required at the present time. Full particulars of the Congress can be obtained from the National Peace Council at 39 Victoria Street, London, S.W.1.

(Signed) E. W. BIRMINGHAM.
HENRY CHELMSFORD.
GEORGE CICESTR.
J. A. LICHFIELD.

London.
May 14th, 1934.

A PACIFIST PROTEST.

SIR,

As a subscriber of long standing I find myself for the first time shocked into utterance by your remarks on paragraph 2 of Dr. Sheppard's programme, and I cannot think that they adequately or even accurately express your considered opinion on what, after all, is now a cardinal problem of Christian ethics.

Is war now, more than it has ever been, just international murder or not? You may say it depends on the circumstances: among these are that the nations have signed a treaty not to resort to war for their own political ends, and that the machinery for organized international peace does now exist if the nations chose to use it.

In those circumstances, then, to put the problem more mildly, are nations morally justified in going for each other as and when they themselves individually judge it to be right?—and are individuals morally justified in obeying their Governments who so act without the organized approval of the whole world?

If the moral rightness of Dr. Sheppard's answer to these questions were universally recognized his refusal to have any lot or part in it would then not be really very different, morally, from the refusal of any other ordinary citizen to become a hangman: it would merely be that order has got to be kept, and he is not going to do the dirty work himself.

Pacifists on this footing are not just half-witted idealists, but have a perfectly well reasoned practical Christian philosophy—though it is often stupidly expressed. My point, however, is that the whole of the organization for which you write is, presumably, itself interested in Christian principles and their application, so that it is not unlikely that there should be at least some, and perhaps a considerable number of, pacifists among its members. Yet, unless some disclaimer is made, you, under such implied embrace as there may be in the editorial 'we,' profess in their name to repudiate convictions for which you affirm a deep respect, and substitute a view which you admit may seem 'certainly sub-Christian.'

But you also do worse than this: you proceed to justify your attitude by speaking of the consecration of force in relation to present-day warfare which, as it now is, automatically and necessarily does involve wholesale

deprivation of life and limb in its most disgusting imaginable forms; and you cover this by merely saying that if things were different in this respect so much the better and that it is the duty of pacifists to make them so.

I will not argue this point, since this letter is already too long: but it is my earnest conviction that the appallingly ill-thought out, non-committal and patently 'sub-Christian' attitude of the Church on all these questions is one of the greatest causes of its present-day discredit, and I implore you to set to work at once to dissociate Modern Churchmen from it.

A. B. ASHBY.

2 Pump Court,
Temple.
May 10th, 1934.

[We are sure that all Modernists who are Pacifists will be glad to read this disclaimer. Of course the editorial 'we' was not intended to include all Modernists, but simply to express the Editor's convictions. —ED., *M.C.*]

CATHOLICISM AND MODERNISM.

SIR,

Will you please forgive the blunt speaking of a business man, but honestly I could hardly believe my eyes when I read Mr. Pittenger's article in your April number. The 'new' Modernism is apparently to be a kind of extreme Anglo-Catholicism with a flexible dogmatic framework capable of accommodating every advance of truth, however destructive of orthodox theology that advance may be. We are to know God 'adequately' only through this wonderful Church and its sacraments, while everybody outside, which means that mighty body of disinterested truth-seekers who are gradually bringing the Church to its senses, are to be satisfied with a partial and pitiable vision of what they might be if only they would bury their heads in the pews of 'catholic' conformity. It would be easy to expose the fallacies which underlie nearly every paragraph of this high-flown extravaganza, but I will apply one test, time-honoured and infallible.

Mr. Pittenger gives us nothing more than Catholic ecclesiasticism, the sort of thing that has gradually distorted the religion of Jesus out of all recognition. It is still true, however, that a tree must be known by its fruits, so as our test, which is the test of Jesus Himself, we will examine the fruits of 1600 years of ecclesiasticism and see whether they are edible or not. These are they:—

1. A laity consisting *principally* of:
   (*a*) Half-educated and misguided sentimentalists.
   (*b*) Pompous or discreet conventionalists.
   (*c*) Spiteful ritualists.
2. A priesthood for the most part of marked intellectual dishonesty and inferior personality.
3. A slip-shod and technically inefficient service by priest, choir and congregation, the artistic and cultural level of which would not be tolerated in a decent concert room or lecture hall.
4. A physically and spiritually unattractive missionary force consisting largely of those who cannot make a living in any other way, and with a capacity for self-deception unrivalled in the world.
5. A censorious outlook on life combined with the sort of mentality which can repeat day after day: 'As we forgive them that trespass against us' and yet retain the bitterest personal resentments, suspicions and prejudices.

6. A thoroughly distorted view of vital questions relating to love, marriage and sex.
7. Daily unblushing adultery with the God of Mammon in all wordly affairs, wars included.
8. Deadly animosity towards every advance of truth in the physical, social, and spiritual worlds.

That is the indictment. When will the Catholic Church realize that Christianity lives not because of the Church but in spite of it? Mr. Pittenger owns up to No. 8. What about the others? And what on earth is the good of a religion which produces this sort of thing? If a religion does not issue in true sincerity and the highest morality what is it but a drug, easing the mind but poisoning the springs of action? I affirm that in the main, taking the large majority of churches at home and abroad, this indictment of Catholic ecclesiasticism is true—I mean the Catholicism which relies on dogma and authority, and has the Eucharist or Mass as the centre of its worship. It is all utterly false and remote from the Spirit of Jesus, which alone will save the world, both from materialism and its near relation, ecclesiasticism. Can one find that Spirit outside the churches? I sometimes think it is only there that one does find it.

Constructive suggestions? CAN these dry bones live? God knows; but surely, in our search for a national religion, we can do better than Mr. Pittenger. We might start, for example, by reducing the Gospels to a bare minimum of agreed probability; by scrapping Prayer-book and hymn books and every vestigial remnant of pagan origin or of mediaeval ecclesiasticism, and by starting anew; as if, with the vastly increased knowledge and experience we now possess, we were constructing a Church of Jesus for the first time; making a deeply reverent and humble attempt to interpret the transcendent Majesty of the Creator-Father, and to translate the Indwelling Spirit in terms of Truth, Courage and Beauty, of Enthusiasm, Generosity and Disinterestedness. . . .

(It is absurd to say that we should be abandoning what is good in the past. We are what we are because of the past, and anything which is true in the past we have assimilated and will express in what we create.)

Having built a new structure on the Foundation of Jesus as we know Him—and we know Him far better than the early Church or even His own disciples ever did—we might broadcast our service of worship and praise from a central Temple. It really thrills one to think what this service might be like—something we might offer the world at large not unworthy of our national past and our heart-felt aspirations—cutting out thousands of inefficient churches and chapels with their conceited and unruly choirs, their deplorable organists and ineffectual clergy.

However, it is not for me to dogmatize; the subject is far too big for any one person. I only know from 40 years of adult life and a wide experience inside and outside churches that if the Catholic Church and its futile imitators ever held the Spirit of Jesus they have long since lost it; and that in any other branch of national activitiy a system which has proved itself a failure is rightly scrapped.

R. C. BRISTOW.

Harbour House,
Ernakulam P.O.,
South India.
May 21st, 1934.

P.S. — I am aware that this letter is not exactly a model of tact and courtesy. It is not meant to be. Matters sometimes reach a stage when

folk who are sweetly reasonable must give way to those who, in committee slang, are not afraid to drop a brick or two. There are plenty of Gospel precedents.—R.C.B.

[Professor Pittenger's article had for its sub-title 'An American View.' We felt the article would interest our readers by indicating that American Modernism is more akin to Continental Modernism than to English Modernism. We hold no brief for American Modernism.—ED., *M.C.*]

SIR,

I recently purchased the six volumes of 'The Modernist Series.' Can you give me any information as to where I can find any *authoritative* information regarding the 'early Gospel-source "Q."'

On page 92 (chapter iv) of *The Church's Creeds* you state: 'The philosophical mind can be monotheist, or pantheist, or atheist, but it cannot be binitarian or polytheistic.' Could not the word trinitarian be substituted for binitarian with equal force? I will not sign myself Constant Reader, for I have only been back in England about a year, and the *Modern Churchman* does not circulate on the Mexican Border, Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico. However, I am a very thorough-going reader of present-day Modernism.

Kindly forgive my intruding on your time, but I would appreciate an answer to my queries.

LEONARD J. DUNNE.

14 Westfield Road,
Southbourne,
Bournemouth, Hants.
May 8th, 1934.

[(1) We would commend B. H. Streeter's *The Four Gospels* (Macmillan), chapters ix and x, 'The Four Document Hypothesis' and 'The Reconstruction of Q.'

(2) We are convinced that Binitarian could not be substituted for Trinitarian with equal force. It was because Binitarianism showed itself to be inadequate philosophically as well as experientially that Trinitarianism took its place. The best treatment of Binitarianism in relation to Trinitarianism is to be found in Essays iv and v, 'The Evolution of the Doctrine of the Trinity,' by Professor K. E. Kirk, and 'The Development of the Doctrine of the Trinity,' by the Rev. R. W. Green in *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation,* edited by Archdeacon Rawlinson, published by Longmans.—ED., *M.C.*]

CORRECTION.

We regret the following misprint in Mr. A. Fulton's letter, published on p. 124 of our last issue. 'My God, my God, for this was I delivered,' should read, in accordance with Mr. Lamsa's contention, 'My God, my God, for this was I destined.' This rendering suggests an interesting parallel with *St. John* xii, 27.—ED., *M.C.*